

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

December 2, 1976
10:30 a.m. - 1:20 p.m.

PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dr. R. Cathcart Smith, Chairman
Mr. Howard L. Burns
Mr. Arthur J. H. Clement, Jr.
Mr. M. Calhoun Colvin
Mrs. Wanda L. Forbes
Mr. F. Mitchell Johnson
Mr. Paul W. McAlister
Dr. John M. Pratt
Mr. William F. Prioleau, Jr.
Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum
Mr. I. P. Stanback
Mr. T. Emmet Walsh

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Mr. Charles A. Brooks
Mrs. Clara W. Evans
Dr. George P. Fulton
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Miss Diane King
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. Hugh Bailey
Mr. Pete Bailey
Dr. Robert P. Bland, Jr.
Dr. Charles Bobo
Dr. Cyril B. Busbee
Mrs. Emily Collum
Mr. Joe B. Davenport
Mr. G. William Dudley, Jr.
Mr. Robert Floyd
The Honorable S. Norwood Gasque
Mr. Joseph W. Jenkins
Mr. L. Roger Kirk
Dr. William H. Knisely
Dr. Clarence L. McEachern
Ms. Judy Rutledge
Dr. S. Thomas Scarborough
Dr. Hunter Stokes
Dr. Robert Taylor
Ms. Joy Tucker
Mr. Mike Ussery
Dr. William W. Vallotton

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

Mr. Robert M. Hitt III
Ms. Warren McInnis

I. Minutes of Meeting of November 5, 1976, Commission Meeting

It was moved (Stanback) and seconded (Colvin) that the minutes of the November 5, 1976, Commission meeting be approved as written. The motion was adopted.

II. Appointment of Committee on Facilities and Federal Programs

In response to requests by several Commission members at the November 5 Commission meeting that a standing committee on capital improvements be appointed, Dr. Smith suggested that the title of the Committee on Federal Programs be changed to the "Committee on Facilities and Federal Programs." The committee would then be charged with the additional responsibility of reviewing capital improvement requests and developing recommendations to the Commission. The Commission concurred in the recommendation of the Chairman.

III. Report of Committee on Academic Program Development

Mr. Quattlebaum, chairman of the Committee on Academic Program Development, reported that the committee had met on November 5 and considered proposals for the following new programs:

a. Ph.D. in Molecular and Cellular Biology - Medical University of South Carolina. The committee recommended that the program be approved with the stipulation that the title be changed to "Cellular and Molecular Biology and Pathobiology." It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Pratt) that the recommendation of the committee be approved. The motion was adopted.

b. Institute for Economic Development in the Pee Dee - Francis Marion College. The committee recommended that the program be approved, subject to the understanding concerning financing recommended by the Commission at its October 20, 1976, meeting (see minutes of meeting, October 20, 1976, p. 242) that \$20,074 be approved under Separately Budgeted Research (Step 13 of the Appropriation Formula) for the Institute for Economic Development in the Pee Dee, for 1977-78, and further, that full coverage of future years' costs be obtained from the participants and other non-State sources. The committee also noted that the creation of formal centers for the conduct of research and public service is not a normal practice in the State colleges, which focus primarily on undergraduate instruction. It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Johnson) that the recommendations of the committee be approved. The motion was adopted.

In addition, the committee considered institutional reports on four existing graduate programs. These reports concerned justification for the continuance of each of the programs. Further study in each case was proposed to be carried out by the affected institutions when the Commission approved the final report on its study of graduate productivity in September, 1975. The committee made the following recommendations:

a. M.S. and Ph.D. in Plant Pathology - Clemson University. The committee recommended that the program be continued.

b. M.S. and Ph.D. in Engineering Mechanics - Clemson University. The committee recommended that the program be continued.

c. M.A. and Ph.D. in Linguistics - University of South Carolina. The committee recommended that the program be continued.

d. M.S. in Animal and Food Industries - Clemson University. The committee recommended that the existing programs leading to the M.S. degree in Animal Science, in Dairy Science, and in Poultry Science be combined into one program leading to the M.S. in Animal and Food Industries.

It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Johnson) that the recommendations of the committee concerning these existing programs be approved. The motion was adopted.

Mr. Clement stated that, as a member of the Committee on Academic Program Development, although he did not oppose these graduate programs, he had some reservations about them because they attract a very limited number of students, according to the information provided by the staff. He stated

that in his view justification was difficult, considering the cost of the programs and the small number of graduates. He expressed the opinion that if South Carolina is to improve the base for higher education in the secondary schools, perhaps the State should allocate a larger proportion of its total resources available for education to the elementary and secondary systems. He commented that if the Commission limits itself to higher education, without considering the total picture of education in the State, it will be building a superstructure on a weak foundation. He requested that the record reflect these observations.

IV. Consideration of Revised Joint Statement of Agreement Between the Commission on Higher Education and the State Board of Nursing

Dr. Boozer stated that since May 6, 1972, the Statewide Master Planning Committee on Nursing Education has operated within the framework of a "Joint Statement" of agreement between the sponsoring agencies -- the State Board of Nursing and the Commission on Higher Education (Exhibit A). With the passage of time and changing circumstances it became clear in mid-1975 that the Joint Statement needed revision (1) to clarify the functions of the Statewide Committee as its emphasis shifted from primarily that of program review to Statewide long-range planning for nursing education, and (2) to clarify the respective roles of the State Board of Nursing and the Commission on Higher Education. A resolution was also adopted by the Health Education Authority in July, 1975, requesting clarification of "Authority for Approval of Educational Programs in Nursing, vis-a-vis the Commission on Higher Education and the State Board of Nursing."

A revised "Joint Statement" of agreement between the Commission and the State Board of Nursing (Exhibit B) resulted from extensive discussions among staff members of the two State agencies and members of the Statewide Master Planning Committee on Nursing Education, the State Board of Nursing, the HEA Task Force on Health Care Team Relationships, and the Health Education Authority. The revision was favorably considered by the HEA on November 10, 1976, and forwarded with the recommendation that it be approved by the Commission on Higher Education. Dr. Boozer stated that he endorsed the recommendation of the Health Education Authority and requested that he be authorized to sign it on behalf of the Commission. It was moved (Pratt) and seconded (Stanback) that the recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

V. Discussion of Optometric Education

Background. Dr. Boozer stated that at the Commission's September 10, 1976, meeting it was requested that "no action be taken concerning the proposed school of optometry until the Commission considers the matter further at its November meeting." Because of other pressing matters on the agenda of the November meeting, further consideration of this subject was deferred until the December meeting. Dr. Boozer's memorandum of November 24, 1976, to the Commission (Exhibit C) summarized the Commission's activities relating to optometric education and recommended the establishment of an Interstate Planning Committee to carry the planning forward and to draft a proposal for federal funding, as proposed by Dr. Fulton in his memorandum to the Commission of November 24. Dr. Boozer recommended further that the Commission request that the draft proposal be submitted to the Commission for consideration as soon as practicable and feasible.

Discussion of the Southern Regional Education Board "Policy Statement and Formulation of an Approach for Cooperative Expansion of Optometric Education for Students from Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina Through a New Tri-State Regional School of Optometry." Dr. Fulton's comments on the features of the SREB "Policy Statement" are summarized in Exhibit D. Mr. Burns inquired concerning the estimated "cost per student on a proportional basis to the number of student places occupied by each state" (Exhibit E), and asked whether the intended meaning was allocated spaces or occupied spaces. Dr. Fulton stated that the spaces would be reserved for each of the three states, and if it should develop that some were not filled, an effort would be made to make them available to other states. He noted that this type of detail would need to be dealt with in the negotiations. He stated that the methodology used in the Policy Statement is sound, and the exact details would be worked out through further negotiation and discussion.

Mr. Burns asked if the estimated cost sharing of operating expenses indicated in Exhibit E had any bearing on the reluctance of Georgia and North Carolina to serve as the host state. Dr. Fulton stated that North Carolina is already heavily involved in medical and veterinary education and has indicated that it does not wish to become further obligated at this time. He noted that Georgia is presently providing spaces to other states in a student contract program in veterinary medicine through the Southern Regional Education Board.

Mr. Burns observed that the annual operating cost to the host state, in addition to its proportional share of student costs, would amount to approximately \$1.4 million. He stated that he did not question the merit of the proposed institution but the economics of it, and that in his view the advantage to the host state was difficult to understand. Dr. Fulton noted that funds from federal sources would be provided the host institution, and that it would be similar to having a new industry in the state. Mr. Burns commented that, as the recommendation is presently stated, the annual operating cost per student to South Carolina would be \$20,000 plus \$3,000 for the State's projected share of operating expenses, amounting to a total annual cost of \$23,000 per student. He stated the view that this amount, contrasted with \$3,000 per student for Georgia and North Carolina, seems out of line, and that if the institution is established, there should be a more equitable distribution of operating costs.

Comments by Chairman of the Task Force on Optometric Education of the Health Education Authority. Mr. Joe B. Davenport, chairman of the HEA Task Force on Optometric Education, reported that, although the Task Force has not yet completed its studies, the following tentative conclusions have been developed: (1) the proposed regional school of optometry is needed to assure continuity of opportunity for students in South Carolina, Georgia, and North Carolina to study the profession of optometry in years to come; (2) the projected size of the entering class will provide for a modest increase in the number of optometrists in proportion to anticipated increases in the population, replace a high proportion of retiring optometrists, and improve the availability of eye care in rural areas; (3) the regional school will provide the resources for high quality training, and placement in an academic health center will foster complementary relationships with all the health professions, including ophthalmology; (4) the regional approach is the most economical because the costs would be shared by the three states and higher quality would more likely result; and (5) the regional school would help the economy of the State by the influx of new students and faculty and administrative personnel.

Mr. Davenport stated that the Task Force has made progress in communication between ophthalmologists and optometrists through its Liaison Committee on the Interrelationships of Ophthalmology and Optometry. He noted that in the near future the Task Force will develop detailed guidelines and criteria for a new school of optometry, and subsequently will recommend the introduction of enabling legislation that would facilitate the necessary cooperative negotiations with Georgia and North Carolina for the consummation of the proposed school of optometry.

Comments from the Perspective of Optometry. Dr. Thomas S. Scarborough, President of the South Carolina Optometric Association and member of the Liaison Committee on the Interrelationships of Ophthalmology and Optometry of the HEA Task Force on Optometric Education, stated that the optometrists of South Carolina believe, for a number of reasons, that a State institution should be available where citizens who wish to become vision health care practitioners can pursue careers in optometry. One of the primary reasons is economics and the belief that the expense of obtaining an optometric degree should be comparable to the cost associated with four years of graduate education in other health professions. He noted that at Southern College of Optometry in Memphis, where South Carolina contracts for eight spaces annually through the SREB program, the tuition, book, and laboratory costs amount to approximately \$6,000 a year.

Dr. Scarborough stated that another concern is the problem of providing a sufficient number of optometrists in the State to meet needs resulting from projected growth in population, anticipated increased use of services if a National Health Insurance program is created in the future, and attrition due to the large proportion of optometrists now practicing in the State who are in the fifty-and-over age group. He commented on the probability that Southern College in Memphis will become a state-supported institution before 1979 and that, as a result, South Carolina's eight contract spaces will be eliminated when citizens of Tennessee are given priority. An additional concern is the need for continuing educational opportunities for optometrists at a State facility actively educating and clinically training optometrists where the faculty and physical facilities are available throughout the year.

An additional concern to optometrists in South Carolina, according to Dr. Scarborough, is that the Black population of the State has found it difficult to gain admission into the schools available through the SREB contract program. As a result, only two Black optometrists are practicing in South Carolina, and only two or three Black students from the State are presently enrolled in schools of optometry.

Dr. Scarborough concluded his remarks by stating that the regional tri-state school of optometry seems to be the ideal solution to the problems concerning eye health care in South Carolina as well as in Georgia and North Carolina. He indicated that the South Carolina Optometric Association would support the establishment of such a school to the limit of its capabilities in the knowledge that the school would be the chief source of advancement in the delivery of vision health care to South Carolinians in the years ahead.

Comments from the Perspective of Ophthalmology. Dr. Robert P. Bland, Jr., an ophthalmologist and the designee of the South Carolina Medical Association on the HEA Task Force on Optometric Education and member of the Liaison Committee

on the Interrelationships of Ophthalmology and Optometry, stated that it was unfortunate that he was appointed to the Task Force subsequent to its first meeting on May 20, 1976, at which time the Task Force went on record as recommending the establishment of the tri-state school of optometry at MUSC. He stated that in his opinion the concept of need, as expressed in the SREB report, is not a valid basis on which to make such a recommendation, and that it would have been advantageous to the Task Force and the Commission on Higher Education if they had considered similar studies made in Maryland and Virginia and the conclusions reached by those states. He stated that two important questions should be resolved before South Carolina commits itself to a new school of optometry: (1) Can South Carolina afford such a school? (2) Should the State's resources be allocated to optometry when other health care needs exist?

Dr. Hunter Stokes, President of the South Carolina Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology Society and member of the Liaison Committee on the Interrelationships of Ophthalmology and Optometry, stated that a number of important facts should be brought to the attention of the Commission before additional steps are taken to commit South Carolina to such a project. Three areas of concern are (1) Does a need exist? (2) Can South Carolina afford the school? and (3) Is Charleston the appropriate location? He stated that the SREB report, developed in 1972-73, is outdated in terms of the number of vision care personnel in the State because there has been growth in both optometry and ophthalmology since that time. The utilization by the HEA Task Force on Optometric Education of statistics related to only the availability of optometrists in terms of providing eye health care to South Carolinians was, in his view, inappropriate. He stated that 87 ophthalmologists currently provide primary eye care on a daily basis in 23 cities and 22 counties in South Carolina, seeing an estimated 600,000 patients annually. According to the information provided by the Commission, the State's 197 optometrists also see 600,000 patients a year, an indication that approximately 1.2 million of the State's 2.75 million residents are provided eye health care services.

Dr. Stokes reported that a recent survey conducted by ophthalmologists around the State shows that the average waiting period for an appointment with an ophthalmologist in South Carolina is two weeks, while the average waiting period to see an optometrist is one day. He stated that in his view these results indicate that patients prefer to consult ophthalmologists for eye examinations and are willing to wait longer to see them. He stated further that there does not exist in South Carolina today a demand for optometric services that is not now being met by the available optometric work force. He noted that, of the 87 ophthalmologists now practicing in the State, 30 were trained in, and 54 are natives of, South Carolina, an indication that the State provides a healthy environment which attracts young, well-trained ophthalmologists into South Carolina. He stated that, according to statistical data provided by the Commission, only 27 optometrists now practicing in the State are within the 30-40 age bracket, while 26 optometrists are under age 30, an indication that about 50 percent of the South Carolina optometric students in the SREB programs in Memphis and Alabama do not presently return to South Carolina to practice. This suggests, in his opinion, that the demand for additional optometric care in the State does not exist at the present time. He stated that as the older optometrists now practicing in the State retire, South Carolina will become more attractive to optometrists and more will return to the State.

Dr. Stokes noted that the proposed project calls for 15 to 20 spaces for optometrists from South Carolina, an increase of only 5 to 10 over the number presently participating in the SREB program, making the estimated additional cost to the host state of \$2 million per year an expensive investment, with no guarantee of retention of optometrists by the State. He noted further that neither Georgia nor North Carolina wanted to serve as the host state; Maryland refused to consider hosting a school; and Virginia decided after a study was made that there was no need for additional optometric availability in that state. In Florida the governor vetoed the funding that would have created the task force on optometric education after health care consultants in his office decided the need did not exist. Dr. Stokes noted that the school of optometry at the University of Alabama at Birmingham is the only such school in the country connected with a medical university, and that no ophthalmologists are on the faculty at that institution.

Dr. Stokes stated further that the population of the Charleston area is not sufficient to support both a school of optometry and the eye institute at MUSC, and if the school of optometry should be established there, the demand for services of the ophthalmology clinic at MUSC would decrease and the effectiveness and quality of medical education for ophthalmologists in the State would be reduced. He expressed the view that if additional funds for eye health care should become available, they should be allocated to the eye institute at MUSC rather than to a school of optometry.

Dr. Stokes concluded his remarks by stating that the ophthalmologists in South Carolina are not opposed to continuing education for optometrists and are willing to provide medical education in those areas in which optometrists are allowed to practice. He commented that if, in the future, the absolute need for additional optometric facilities is proven, and the funds are available to support that need, the ophthalmologists would be supportive of the development of an institution to educate optometrists in the three-state area, but that it is the view of the ophthalmological profession that Atlanta is the only city in the three states that could support such an institution and provide adequate educational opportunities to optometrists.

Comments from the Perspective of Prospective Host Institution. Dr. William W. Vallotton, Chairman of the Department of Ophthalmology at MUSC and member of the HEA Task Force on Optometric Education, stated that there are optometric institutions in the country associated with medical institutions, such as those in Indiana, Ohio, and California. He noted that information received from the University of Alabama indicates that the school of optometry there has had no effect on the patient load at the ophthalmological clinic at the University Hospital or the residency training program. He stated that in his view the optometrists, rather than the ophthalmologists, are seeking patients. He commented that he is less enthusiastic about the proposed school than he was earlier and that at this time he is not in favor of the recommendation that it be located in Charleston unless a number of logistics problems can be resolved.

Dr. Knisely stated that in his view it is unfortunate that the Task Force made recommendations concerning the proposed tri-state school of optometry before Dr. Bland was appointed to serve on that committee. Dr. Knisely reported that representatives of the South Carolina Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology Society have requested that he review the recommendation he made to the Board of Trustees at the Medical University that MUSC serve as the

host institution to the tri-state school of optometry. He noted that Dr. Stokes had interpreted 1.2 million visits to mean 1.2 million patients, and that in his opinion it is unlikely that 1.2 million of the State's population receive eye health care annually.

He noted that it was also unfortunate that the interpretation was made that these deliberations were handled in a hasty manner, because that had not been the case. He recommended that the Commission arrange to have data collected by uninvolved professional statisticians so that each of the professions, organizations, and institutions might evaluate the data and make its own judgment concerning a regional school of optometry.

Dr. Knisely stated that in his opinion one of the most important meetings related to eye care in South Carolina was that of the Liaison Committee on the Interrelationships of Ophthalmology and Optometry, chaired by Representative Patrick B. Harris. He stated that if the tri-state school is established, he would like for it to be located in Charleston, but that there is no reason to build a school of optometry in any of the three states if the graduates of that school would not serve the needs of the states. He observed that the goal of all the bodies involved is to determine the best ways to provide eye care for the people of South Carolina, and that it is his hope that neither the institutions involved nor the two professions will compete with each other to the detriment of the State, because South Carolina needs the best resources that can be provided.

Other Comments. Representative S. Norwood Gasque, member of the HEA Task Force on Optometric Education, commented that it has been a pleasure for him to work with the Task Force under the leadership of Mr. Davenport. He stated that if the plan for a tri-state school is approved, he will be happy to go to the medical affairs committees of the House and Senate, on behalf of the Commission, to see that appropriate legislation is prepared and introduced to implement the plan, and further, that he would be happy to sponsor or co-sponsor any legislation to bring the plan into reality. He offered his assistance to Commission members and others concerned with eye health care.

Mr. Walsh, who worked with Dr. Draffin, Dr. Fulton, representatives of the optometric associations and others in the three-state area, and SREB in developing the "Policy Statement and Formulation of an Approach for Cooperative Expansion of Optometric Education," stated that important points to consider are that: (1) medical and other health education is so expensive today that some form of cooperative education must be adopted where possible; and (2) the determination of financial ability is not the responsibility of the Commission on Higher Education but of the General Assembly. He noted that need should be considered not only in South Carolina but in the three-state area. The Commission can provide the information and data on which the General Assembly can make an informed judgment, taking into consideration other compelling needs of the State, now and in the future. He stated that the three states recognize that if the school is approved in principle and they are then authorized to enter into negotiations, the details of financing and of allocation of spaces would have to be worked out through an agreement among the three states and various representatives of SREB.

Mr. Joseph W. Jenkins, Executive Director of the South Carolina Optometric Association, commented in response to Dr. Stokes' statement that South Carolina students of optometry are not returning to the State to practice that he went to the Legislature to request funds for contract services through

the Southern Regional Education Board so that South Carolina students of optometry might be admitted to other schools around the country. He noted that South Carolina had only two spaces per year in optometry at one time, and the reason the State has so few young optometrists now practicing is that the first class of ten will graduate this year.

Dr. Boozer stated, as a matter of clarification, that subsequent to the December, 1974, SREB report, a work session of people from the Southeastern states representing higher education coordinating and governing boards, major university centers, and deans of the three optometric schools in the region met in Atlanta. Later SREB requested that the higher education coordinating and governing boards in the three states designate key staff members to work together in reference to the SREB report and recommendations. The Task Force on Optometric Education of the HEA was appointed in February, 1976. A few days later, letters of invitation were mailed to prospective members of the Task Force. On February 10, at Mr. Davenport's suggestion, Dr. Boozer wrote to Dr. Lamb, an ophthalmologist, inviting him to be a member of the Task Force. When it was learned later that Dr. Lamb could not serve, Dr. Boozer wrote, on April 16, to the president of the South Carolina Medical Association inviting him to name an ophthalmologist to serve as a member. On April 19 the announcement of the first meeting of the Task Force, scheduled for April 30, was mailed. When it developed that that date was not suitable, the meeting was rescheduled for May 20. On May 21, the day after the first meeting, Dr. Boozer received a letter dated May 18 from the president of the Medical Association designating Dr. Bland as a member of the Task Force. Within two or three working days, a letter inviting Dr. Bland to serve on the committee went to Dr. Bland from Dr. Boozer.

At its July 8, 1976, meeting the Commission authorized Dr. Boozer to write President Godwin of SREB that, "subject to approval and funding by the General Assembly, (1) the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education believes that South Carolina should participate in the proposed tri-state regional school of optometry; (2) the Commission believes that South Carolina should be considered for selection as the host state; (3) the Medical University of South Carolina in Charleston is interested in serving as the site for the proposed school if financial assistance is made available from the three participating states and from the Federal Government; and (4) if South Carolina is successful in being selected as the host state, the school of optometry be established at the Medical University of South Carolina."

On October 8, this matter was before the Board of Governors of the North Carolina System of Higher Education and its action was as follows: "(1) The State of North Carolina is not in position to undertake the responsibilities of being the host state of the proposed school of optometry, but (2) The State of North Carolina would be interested in joining with the states of Georgia and South Carolina in the development of a specific proposal for a jointly-sponsored school of optometry to serve this three-state region, the school to be funded along the general lines of the joint funding proposal set forth in the April 5 policy statement."

On November 12 the Board of Regents of the Georgia University System recommended, ". . . after due consideration of the 'Policy Statement and Formulation of an Approach for Cooperative Expansion of Optometric Education' [that Georgia] join with the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina and the Southern Regional Education Board in the development of a specific proposal for a tri-state school of optometry to which the respective boards or commission of the

three states may respond. Recommended further: That the Board of Regents finds it is not in a position to accept the responsibilities of being the host state for the tri-state school of optometry. Recommended further: That the Chancellor, on behalf of the Board of Regents, inform the appropriate officials of the Southern Regional Education Board and the governing or coordinating boards for higher education of North Carolina and South Carolina of these actions."

Dr. Boozer reiterated the recommendation that the Commission endorse the proposal made by Dr. Fulton that an Interstate Planning Committee be established to carry the planning forward and to draft a proposal for federal funding, to be submitted to the Commission for consideration as soon as practicable and feasible.

In response to Dr. Bland's statement that he received the letter notifying him of his appointment to the Task Force too late for the first meeting on May 20, and that "the ophthalmologists in the State had not even been consulted in the matter until after the fact," Dr. Smith stated that the South Carolina Medical Association approved the appointment of one of their members to the Task Force but did not take action on the matter or notify Dr. Bland of his appointment for approximately three weeks. Dr. Bland stated that he had read newspaper reports before he was appointed that the Task Force had approved the concept of the tri-state school. Mr. Davenport noted that he had stated at the outset that he would not serve as chairman of the Task Force unless there was to be participation by ophthalmologists as members. He commented that the Task Force had made no commitment but had merely stated its interest in the regional school and in South Carolina's being the host state.

Mr. Clement noted that Dr. Scarborough's mention of the lack of minority providers of eye health services in South Carolina was of interest and concern to him and should have the consideration of the Commission. He inquired of Dr. Stokes concerning the existence among ophthalmologists of a desire to limit the number practicing in the profession because of the personal income potential. Dr. Stokes stated that it may appear that the ophthalmological profession is acting as an obstructionist, but that is not its purpose. He stated that ophthalmologists are making every effort to increase the number of eye health care professionals in the State, and that the number of both ophthalmologists and optometrists increases each year. He stated that the ophthalmologists are not interested in suppression of any health care professionals for the purpose of financial gain or any other reason.

Dr. Bland stated that he has been trying for some time to persuade other ophthalmologists to practice in Sumter, and that the concept that ophthalmologists can increase their income by restricting the practice of others is not true.

Dr. Pratt stated that the Board of Trustees of MUSC is interested in the tri-state school of optometry, if it is to be established. He commented that the main responsibility is to assist in providing maximal health service to the people of South Carolina. He noted that he and Dr. Vallotton would present the facts concerning the recommendation and action of the Commission to the Medical University Board's Education Faculty and Student Affairs Committee in the near future.

Dr. Smith stated that the Commission's action on July 8 was predicated on the study of the HEA Task Force as well as an indication from the MUSC Board of Trustees, President Knisely, and the Chairman of the Department of Ophthalmology that they were interested in looking further into the proposed school of optometry.

Action Taken by the Commission. Mr. Prioleau suggested that the Commission recess briefly and request that a committee, consisting of Dr. Knisely, chairman; Mr. Davenport, Mr. Gasque, Dr. Scarborough, and Dr. Stokes, prepare a motion for the Commission to consider.

Mr. Clement stated that the recommendation of Dr. Boozer in his November 24 memorandum to the Commission and reiterated in his comments (page 10 above) provided a reasonable rationale on which to proceed ["that the Commission take the initiative in establishing an Interstate Planning Committee, and that the Committee be asked to prepare a draft proposal on this matter for submission back to the Commission."]. Mr. Clement noted that essentially the same endorsement was made by Georgia and North Carolina, except that the initiative must rest with South Carolina, the only one of the three states that indicated interest in being the host state.

Mr. McAlister requested that the following be added to the recommendation: "and that the Committee provide up-to-date supporting data concerning optometric education in South Carolina, now and in the projected five-year period."

Mr. Quattlebaum stated that such a recommendation would amount to a commitment on the part of the Commission and would be, in his opinion, unwise. He requested that the Commission conduct further studies before it asks other states to cooperate with South Carolina in a proposal to federal agencies. Dr. Boozer stated that the other two states, by their actions, have already expressed their willingness to cooperate. Mr. Quattlebaum stated that, in his view, some of the data which have been provided Commission members are conflicting. He requested additional time in which to interpret the information, and suggested that a decision be deferred until more current data are available.

It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Clement) that the Commission request that the Health Education Authority, through its Task Force on Optometric Education, and the staff gather additional data concerning the need for optometry and ophthalmology in South Carolina, now and in the projected five- to ten-year period, and that the Chairman appoint an Interstate Planning Committee to meet with similar representatives from Georgia and North Carolina to proceed with the development of a draft proposal (a financial plan, etc.), to be returned to the Commission for further consideration. The motion was adopted.

VI. Other Business

Mr. Clement inquired concerning an advertisement that appeared in recent issues of the Chronicle of Higher Education of an institution at Myrtle Beach which provides the Ph.D. degree with one month's residency. Dr. Kinard noted that this matter had come to the attention of the staff through a telephone call from an advertising representative of a national magazine. The staff learned that the institution is chartered as a profit-making organization by the Secretary of State of South Carolina and is operating under State laws as they now exist. It is owned by an individual and his wife.

Dr. Knisely stated that the Council of Presidents of the Public Senior Colleges and Universities has discussed the problem that such institutions exist, usually in connection with military bases although the majority of students are not military personnel. He commented that this subject has been discussed in detail by the Charleston Consortium.

Dr. Boozer stated that there are a number of programs on military bases provided by accredited institutions around the country, often by contractual arrangements between a branch of the military service and the institution. There also exist institutions which can be chartered under the laws of a state that may not be in the usual definition of a bona fide institution. He commented that there is continuing discussion among the staffs of the Attorney General's Office, the State Department of Education, and the Commission concerning possible legislation which would affect such institutions in South Carolina. Several states have recently enacted such legislation and others are in the process of doing so. Dr. Boozer noted that an important responsibility of colleges and universities is that of providing a voluntary education program for military personnel, and that he has been a member until recently of a Task Force on Postsecondary Education of Military Personnel, created by the Education Commission of the States.

Dr. Knisely expressed appreciation to the Commission, on behalf of the Council of Presidents of the Public Senior Colleges and Universities, for responding to the Council's request on November 5 (see minutes of CHE meeting, November 5, 1976, p. 250) that the Commission recommend to the Budget and Control Board that positions funded from federal and private sources be exempted from the personnel freeze.

On motion made (Colvin) and seconded (Stanback) and unanimously voted, the meeting was adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gaylon Syrett

Gaylon Syrett
Recording Secretary