

MINUTES OF MEETING  
OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

July 8, 1976  
10:30 a.m. - 12:30 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. Gedney M. Howe, Jr.  
Mr. F. Mitchell Johnson  
Mr. Paul W. McAlister  
Mr. T. Eston Marchant  
Mr. William F. Prioleau, Jr.  
Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum  
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, Jr.  
Mr. J. Clyde Shirley  
Mr. I. P. Stanback  
Mr. Arthur M. Swanson

GUESTS

Dr. Hiram Curry  
Dr. T. E. Gaffney  
Dr. William H. Golod  
Mr. Kenneth Kyre  
Dr. Benjamin F. Lawson  
Mr. J. Lacy McLean  
Dr. J. Cordell Maddox  
Dr. William H. Knisely

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer  
Mrs. Clara W. Evans  
Dr. George P. Fulton  
Dr. Frank E. Kinard  
Mr. James R. Michael  
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

Mr. Frank Hunt  
Ms. Margaret Locklair

I. Approval of Minutes of June 10, 1976, Commission Meeting

Dr. Smith noted that the third paragraph on page 9 of the June 10, 1976, minutes had been corrected to read: "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.)"

It was moved (Swanson) and seconded (Marchant) and unanimously voted that the minutes of the June 10, 1976, Commission meeting be approved, as corrected.

II. Executive Committee Recommendations Concerning South Carolina's Participation in a Regional School of Optometry

Dr. Fulton reported that, through the coordinative effort of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), representatives of the Commission and the South Carolina Optometric Association have worked with counterparts from Georgia and North Carolina in the development of a policy statement and formulation that would serve as a model for the establishment of a tri-state regional school of optometry to be located in one state for the benefit of the three states. The plan requires that the school be placed in a major

academic health Center. A mechanism is proposed for sharing capital costs as well as annual operating costs of the school. The model responds to the needs of the three states while providing for a quality facility and program that could not be replicated by the limited financial resources available to one state alone.

The SREB has approved and released the "Policy Statement and Formulation of an Approach for Cooperative Expansion of Optometric Education for the Students from Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina through a New Tri-State Regional School of Optometry," for consideration by the higher education agencies of the three states. Dr. Boozer and the executive officers of the state governing or coordinating boards of higher education in Georgia and North Carolina have been requested to report to SREB, on behalf of their respective agencies, whether or not the state wishes to participate and whether or not the state wishes to be considered as the possible host state for the school.

Dr. Fulton noted that the proposal was reviewed by the Task Force on Optometric Education of the Health Education Authority. He read a statement by Mr. Joe B. Davenport, Chairman of the Task Force (Exhibit A). The Health Education Authority endorsed the recommendation of the Task Force that South Carolina should declare (1) an interest in participating in a tri-state regional school of optometry, and (2) an interest in serving as the host state for the regional school (Exhibit B). Dr. Fulton reported that the Commission's Executive Committee concurs in the recommendations of the Health Education Authority and recommends that Dr. Boozer be authorized to inform the Southern Regional Education Board 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; and that (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.

It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Swanson) that the recommendations of the Executive Committee be approved. The motion was amended (Johnson) to provide for the addition of a fourth recommendation: "(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."

Mr. Burns inquired concerning the need for such a school in the three states. Dr. Boozer noted that the Planning Commission was provided information on manpower needs for optometric education in progress reports to the Commission on December 4, 1975, and June 2, 1976 (Exhibit C). He stated that the Southern Regional Education Board approached the development of the proposed school on the basis of the need for subregional schools in which participating states would share capital costs as well as operating costs, as an alternate to the procedure followed in developing certain other regional schools in which the host state has provided the full capital investment.

In response to a question from Mr. Shirley concerning cost to the State, recently compiled data sheets were distributed indicating "Estimated Costs for Regional School of Optometry" (Exhibit D). Dr. Fulton stated that, if the State consents to be a participant, a major assessment will be made concerning financial needs.

Mr. Burns asked if Commission endorsement of the recommendations would constitute a commitment on the part of South Carolina. Dr. Fulton stated that it would be a statement of interest rather than a commitment, and that in the progressive development of the model the next step would be for Dr. Boozer, on behalf of the Commission, to respond to the inquiries of the Southern Regional Education Board concerning South Carolina's interest in participating. Dr. Boozer noted that the Commission's recommendations would be subject to approval and funding by the General Assembly.

Mr. Shirley asked if students from nonparticipating states would be eligible to attend the proposed school. Dr. Fulton stated that it was agreed in the planning discussions that there would be a mechanism through the SREB contract program to respond to prospective students from other states, if spaces were available.

Dr. Davis stated that in her view one of the positive aspects of having a tri-state school would be the State's involvement in a consortium arrangement with the two other states.

On invitation from the Chairman, Dr. Knisely stated that, in his opinion and in the opinion of the Chairman of the Department of Ophthalmology at MUSC, there is a need for optometrists, and that a School of Optometry located at the Medical University would provide an excellent opportunity for the training of the full complement of eye care personnel. He noted that a well-trained optometrist not only can perform most routine eye testing but also can detect problems such as diabetes, for example, and refer the patient to a physician or an ophthalmologist. He stated that it would be his intent that the School of Optometry be located as close to the Department of Ophthalmology as possible, and urged the Commission to endorse the recommendations of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Burns stated that in his opinion the proposal calls for more extensive discussion. Mr. Prioleau favored emphasis on having an outstanding Department of Ophthalmology, and objected to the recommendation that the proposed school be located at the Medical University in proximity to the Department of Ophthalmology. After further discussion, the motion to approve the recommendations of the Executive Committee, as amended, was adopted.

### III. Capital Improvement Requests -- Clemson University

Mr. Michael stated that Clemson University has submitted three Permanent Improvement requests (Relocation of the Band Practice Room to Holtzendorff Hall: \$100,000; Newman Hall Lecture Room: \$65,000; and Support Facility for Daniel Hall Auditorium: \$150,000), all to be funded through Institution Bonds and/or Plant Improvement Bonds, at a total cost of \$315,000. Two improvements renovate existing space while the third adds a small support facility to an existing structure. The staff recommended approval of all three projects. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Shirley) and unanimously voted that the recommended be approved.

### IV. Report of Legislative Relations Committee

In the absence of Mr. Walsh, chairman of the Legislative Relations Committee, Mr. Michael reported on highlights of legislation enacted by the 1976 General Assembly. He noted that several bills affecting higher education are pending as the Legislature prepares to adjourn. The General Appropriation Bill, passed as reported to the Commission at its June 10 meeting (see minutes of the June 10 meeting, pp. 215-16), mandates the following: a 4 percent salary increase for

State employees, in effect, reducing each agency's appropriation by 1 to 2 percent; zero base budgeting, requiring justification of all items rather than simply the increases; and approval by the Budget and Control Board of all Federal funds allocated to State agencies and institutions, as discussed at the May 6 Commission meeting (see minutes of May 6, 1976, meeting, p. 212). The Bill also established a Dean's Committee on Medical Doctor Education, as reported at the June 10 meeting (see minutes of the June 10, 1976, meeting, p. 215), a coordinating and advisory committee which will be provided support services by the Commission.

Mr. Michael stated that the Bill affecting the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education (H.3662 -- see minutes of June 10 meeting, p. 216) was ratified and signed by Governor Edwards. The "Lake Bill" (H.3738 -- see minutes of June 10 meeting, p. 215) has not been acted upon, but the "Lake Committee" will continue to operate during the next fiscal year, in accordance with a provision contained in the General Appropriation Bill. He noted that the Stevenson Bill (R.641-H.3270) will require all State agencies to submit detailed quarterly reports of expenditures from all sources to the General Assembly.

#### V. Schedule of Commission Meetings on Campuses

Dr. Boozer noted that Commission members were provided, prior to the meeting, a tentative schedule, developed by the Council of Presidents of Public Senior Colleges and Universities, of Commission meetings to be held on campuses (Exhibit E). He recommended that, as the Commission has not held meetings in August for the past two years, a meeting not be scheduled for August of this year, and further, due to the proximity to the Labor Day weekend, that the September meeting be scheduled on the second Thursday in the month. Dr. Smith suggested, and the Commission agreed, that the meetings on campuses be scheduled on Fridays rather than on Thursdays. He suggested also that the Commission hold a weekend meeting with the Council of Presidents as soon as practicable.

Mr. McAlister suggested that the Commission meet at Clemson on a football weekend. Dr. Davis requested that the Commission follow its regular schedule as closely as possible. Mr. Quattlebaum recommended that the meeting with the presidents not be planned on a campus when a football game is scheduled. Dr. Smith suggested that, because of the Commission's budget meetings in October and the various football schedules during the fall, January might be the most appropriate month for a weekend meeting. Dr. Knisely stated that it is important that the two groups meet jointly at an early enough date to have effect on legislation for the following year. Dr. Smith requested that Dr. Boozer and the staff attempt to work out, as soon as possible, the most suitable time to schedule a weekend meeting. It was moved (Johnson) and seconded (Shirley) to adopt the staff recommendation (1) that a meeting not be scheduled for August; (2) that the September meeting be held on Friday, September 10, at Francis Marion College; and (3) that the meetings on campuses be held on Fridays rather than on Thursdays. The motion was approved.

#### VI. Report of Executive Director

Dr. Boozer reported that South Carolina was represented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Education Board in Atlanta on June 15-17 by Senator Robert C. Lake, Jr., President Robert C. Edwards, President Gordon W. Blackwell, Mr. Roger Kirk representing Governor Edwards, and Dr. Boozer. Following that

meeting, Dr. Boozer attended the initial meeting, on June 17-18, of the State Higher Education Coordination Advisory Board, recently established by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The SACS Advisory Board is comprised of heads of state coordinating and governing agencies in the Southeast.

Dr. Boozer also attended, on June 18-19, the Annual Meeting of the South Carolina Foundation of Independent Colleges in Greenville, at which Mr. Jennings made a major presentation on computerization in public higher education. In this presentation, which was very well received, he urged that private institutions explore the feasibility of joint efforts in the utilization of computer technology, and suggested ways that public and private sectors might work together to make better joint use of available resources.

A regional meeting held in Knoxville on June 20-21, under the auspices of the Education Commission of the States, was attended by staff representatives from state coordinating and governing agencies and from the private college sectors in eight Southeastern states. Dr. Kinard and Dr. Boozer represented the Commission. President Gordon W. Blackwell, President J. Cordell Maddox, and Mr. J. Lacy McLean, at the invitation of Dr. Boozer, represented private higher education in South Carolina.

Dr. Boozer reported that he had decided some months ago not to attend the Annual Meeting of the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO), to be held in San Diego on July 27-30. Because of the stringent budget situation, no out-of-State travel is being made by staff members of the Commission unless absolutely necessary. He stated that he had recently received an invitation, as a senior member of SHEEO, to assist at the San Diego meeting in an orientation program for newly appointed directors and chancellors of state coordinating and governing boards over the country, sponsored by the Inservice Education Program of SHEEO and the Education Commission of the States. He noted that he had accepted the invitation and now plans to attend, as transportation expenses will be paid by the SHEEO/ECS project. Dr. Davis stated that she found it disturbing that Dr. Boozer had not planned to attend such an important national meeting because of lack of funds. She expressed the view that South Carolina should always be represented at a national meeting of executive directors of coordinating and governing agencies, and that the Commission should reassess its priorities, if necessary, in order to give its executive director stronger support.

#### VII. Other Business

Dr. Boozer noted that the Commission, at its June 10 meeting, approved the 1977-78 Appropriation Formula, leaving Step 10 as it was in the 1976-77 Formula rather than adopting the "uniform fee structure" recommended by the Commission's Budget and Finance Committee. The Committee's recommendation at the June 10 meeting (see minutes, pp. 218-220) had been that the institutions

"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."

Dr. Boozer noted that a major reason for Commission rejection of the uniform fee structure was its adverse effect on South Carolina State College. The Commission

had requested that the staff continue its discussions and investigations of Step 10 and bring new facts to its attention at a subsequent meeting.

Dr. Boozer stated that the staff had discussed the uniform fee structure with the financial or budget officers at the institutions and found that the majority would welcome it. As a result, the staff recommended that the Commission consider that the uniform fee structure as proposed by the Budget and Finance Committee be adopted with the exception that South Carolina State be allowed to use \$75 per FTE student rather than the \$200 recommended for the colleges.

Mr. Marchant inquired concerning the views of the Council of Presidents of Public Senior Colleges and Universities regarding the Budget and Finance Committee's recommendation. Mr. Johnson stated that the Council of Presidents was unanimous in opposition to the recommendation. Dr. Boozer stated that the committee had noted the Council of Presidents' recommendation that per student ceilings of \$250 for colleges and \$325 for universities be placed on income to be deducted in Step 10. In the opinion of the committee, this did not specify a reasonable level of contribution from all institutions, did not produce interinstitutional equity, and did not provide incentive for those institutions below the ceiling to increase student fees where such increases may otherwise be justified and needed.

Mr. Johnson stated his objection to the statement that a primary reason for Commission rejection of the uniform fee structure was its effect on South Carolina State College. He stated that, in his opinion, the recommendation of the staff was entirely premature and that the staff had not done its homework in consulting with the institutions to determine their needs concerning capital program development and how the money can be used to the best advantage of the institutions of the State. He stated the view that the deductions should not be uniform because the needs of the institutions are not uniform, and that a portion of each institution's unassigned fees can be justified for use as plant improvement funds.

Mr. Burns stated that, in his opinion, the Commission should encourage the governing bodies of the institutions to increase the amount of student fee contributions for operational purposes. He suggested that each institution contribute the same fixed amount to the State Treasury and that the institutions be allowed to retain student fees in excess of that amount, thereby providing incentive for the institutions to increase student fees.

Mr. Quattlebaum stated that in his view it would be unwise to adopt the staff recommendation without detailed consultation with the administration of each institution. Mr. Colvin stated that Formula Step 10 was a major consideration of the Budget and Finance Committee in developing its recommendations to the Commission prior to its June 10 meeting. He noted that Step 10 was being reconsidered at this time in keeping with the Commission's continuing effort to achieve an equitable solution for the distribution of funds. He recommended that the staff consult with the institutions, review the matter further, and report back to the Commission at its next meeting.

Mr. Prioleau stated that Commission members would have been better prepared to discuss the matter if it had appeared on the agenda. He suggested that the Commission be provided a written recommendation in advance of its next meeting. Mr. Johnson reiterated that the staff had not consulted with each of the colleges and universities, as it had been instructed to do, in order to obtain a breakdown of all fees, of assigned fees, and of capital improvement needs. Dr. Smith



noted that the staff had contacted the financial officers of the institutions prior to formulating the recommendation. Mr. Johnson stated that the staff should realize that assigning fees and making determinations concerning tuition are the responsibilities of the boards of trustees rather than the financial officers of the institutions, and further, that no member of the staff had contacted the College of Charleston, Francis Marion College, or Lander College.

It was moved (Colvin) and seconded (Prioleau) that the staff consult with each institution concerning an equitable method of handling Step 10, review the matter further, and report back to the Commission at its next meeting. Mr. Prioleau requested that the motion be amended to include the provision that Commission members be provided copies of the staff recommendation in advance of the meeting and that consideration of Step 10 be included on the agenda. The motion was adopted.

Dr. Davis announced that she recently had completed a nine-chapter book, to be released in September, for the State of South Carolina and the Human Affairs Commission, dealing with a portion of the history of the State. She indicated that Dr. Boozer would be provided complimentary copies for all members of the Commission, and stated that she would be especially pleased for Commission members to read the chapter on education. She announced, in addition, that Governor Edwards will preside over the unveiling of a portrait of one of the State's important citizens, Mary McLeod Bethune, on Saturday, July 11, at the State House. She urged all those able to do so to attend this ceremony.

#### VIII. Presentations by the Medical University of South Carolina

Dr. Knisely welcomed the Commission to the Medical University and invited members and guests to accompany him and his staff, following the meeting, on a tour of various facilities on the campus. He introduced the following faculty and staff members who made presentations to the Commission: Dr. Hiram B. Curry, Director of Family Practice; Dr. Thomas E. Gaffney, Chairman, Department of Pharmacology; Dr. William H. Golod, Dean, College of Pharmacy; and Dr. Benjamin F. Lawson, Dean, College of Allied Health Sciences. At the conclusion of their presentations, the Chairman expressed to Dr. Draffin and President Knisely and his colleagues the appreciation of the Commission for the luncheon, the briefing, and the generous welcome and hospitality that had been extended.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Gaylon Syrett*  
Gaylon Syrett  
Recording Secretary