

Desegregation Plan Cumulative Allocations*
1981-82 through 1983-84

Institution	Student Recruitment /Retention (Undergraduate)	Student Recruitment Graduate and Professional	Faculty/ Staff Recruitment	Enhancement	Total
The Citadel	\$ 39,384	\$ 21,937	\$ 51,775	\$	\$ 113,096
Clemson	103,828	85,078	175,461		364,367
College of Charleston	84,034	42,212	10,000		136,246
Francis Marion	108,181	-	14,500		122,681
Lander	126,750	-	15,000		141,750
MUSC	-	239,151 ^a	13,000		252,151 ^b
S.C. State	66,798	135,166	-	4,398,725	4,600,689 ^c
USC-Columbia	167,086	128,238	27,794		323,118 ^c
USC-Aiken	27,744	-	950		28,694
USC-Coastal	7,444	-	-		7,444
USC-Spartanburg	43,604	-	-		43,604
Winthrop	130,609	67,212	68,500		266,321
Denmark TEC	94,278	-	-	527,773	122,051
Totals	\$ 999,740	\$ 718,994	\$ 376,980	\$4,926,498	\$7,022,212
Systemwide Activities					48,396
Funds to be re-allocated					162,282
Commission (Monitoring, evaluation, administration)					152,237
Grand Total					\$7,385,127

^aIncludes undergraduate, graduate and professional recruitment funds.

^bDoes not include capital improvement funds for construction of new building for Business Administration (\$6,300,000)

^cIncludes \$17,400 for systemwide products and activities.

* This allocation does not include all State funds appropriated for Desegregation Plan implementation. The Budget and Control Board allocates funds for annual salary increases and increases in fringe benefits to all institutions with personnel employed with Plan funds. Approximately \$123,000 has been allocated for this purpose by the Budget and Control Board.



CLEMSON
UNIVERSITY

PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

February 23, 1984

Mr. Fred R. Sheheen
Camden Company
P. O. Box 9
Camden, South Carolina 29202

Dear Fred:

The minutes of the February meeting of the Commission indicate (p.8) that "President Jackson suggested that the Commission meet with the chairmen of the governing boards in an effort to work out a reasonable solution."

Except for this somewhat tangential statement there is no indication that the institutional spokesmen present (including Dr. Borkowski and I) strongly opposed the recommendation that the control of the Commission over tuition and fees be extended to authority to set maximum and minimum fees. Since in other instances in which institutional representatives opposed proposed actions of the Commission this fact was noted (e.g., p. 2) the impression that the reader of the minutes receives is that there was little opposition from the institutions to the recommendation on tuition and fees.

I am sure that this omission was inadvertent and I am also sure that you would wish the minutes to portray accurately the actual discussion that occurred. If the views of institutional representatives are deemed of sufficient importance to be entertained it would appear that they would be sufficiently important to be noted in the minutes. If not, fairness would appear to dictate that they be consistently omitted. In this way we would have a ready response to our own constituencies when the Commission takes some action that the academic communities strongly oppose. We could either point to the minutes as evidence that we did indeed oppose the action or else indicate that the Commission never acknowledges our views.

Sincerely yours,

W. David Maxwell
Provost and Vice President
for Academic Affairs

WDM/ep

cc: President Bill L. Atchley
Dr. Frank Borkowski