

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

1333 MAIN STREET

SUITE 550

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29201

HOWARD R. BOOZER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

April 23, 1986

TELEPHONE
803/758-2407MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Commission on Higher Education

FROM: Fred R. Sheheen, Chairman

Proposed Work Plan for
Study of the Recommendations in
the AVA Report*

The Commission charged the staff with drafting a plan for examining the recommendations that are found in chapters V and VI of the AVA study. A wide variety of alternative approaches were studied. These included the use of already existing advisory and standing committees and the appointment of a single "blue ribbon" committee through which individual study groups would report to the Commission. As different approaches were examined, it became apparent that most of the AVA recommendations are interrelated and could be divided into natural groups. It was also clear that consideration of several of the recommendations will require intensive collection and investigation of data from South Carolina institutions and from other states where similar concepts have been implemented. In addition, it appeared that some recommendations should be studied and implemented as rapidly as possible, while others would require long term study and gradual implementation.

The following plan, which was considered and endorsed by the Executive Committee on April 11, is recommended for approval by the Commission. The plan calls for six task forces of three different types. Two of the task forces are further divided into three task groups to study specific issues in depth. The recommended organization of the task forces follows:

* Approved by the Commission on Higher Education on May 1, 1986.

I. Task Force on Institutional and Statewide Planning and Quality Assessment (Attachment 1)

A. Purpose - to study the development of planning and quality assessment as a continuous process in higher education in South Carolina. This task force will have responsibility for the following AVA recommendations.

1. Recommendation 1A (Definition of Quality) - p.79.
(Responsibility for developing a comprehensive definition depending on the specific findings of individual task forces.)
2. Recommendation 1B (Institutional Plans for Quality) - p.79.
3. Recommendation 1C (Institutional Procedures for Quality Assessment) - p.79.
4. Recommendation 1D (Standard Procedures for Quality Assessment) - p.79.
5. Recommendation 14 (Mission Statements and Institutional Profiles) - p.105.

B. Membership and Organization

1. Nine representatives from the senior public colleges and universities, only one of whom shall represent the U.S.C. system.
2. One representative from the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education with statewide planning responsibilities.
3. Four representatives of private colleges and universities.
4. Three lay citizens.
5. One member of the General Assembly.
6. One CHE staff member with primary responsibility for Planning.

C. Staff Resources - One staff member with primary responsibility for planning.

D. Time Frame - This task force will be permanent and will issue reports and recommendations periodically. The first of these reports will be due on October 15, 1986.

II. Task Force on Standards (Attachment 2)

A. Purpose - to study and make recommendations concerning admissions, developmental education, and student assessment. This task force will have responsibility for the following AVA recommendations:

1. Recommendation 2 (Entrance Criteria) - p.86.
2. Recommendation 4 (Developmental Education) - p.89.
3. Recommendation 3 (Student Assessment) - p.87.

B. Membership and Organization

1. Six lay citizens, one of whom will serve as chairperson.
2. Three members of the General Assembly.
3. Nine institutional representatives, two from the private institutions and seven from the public institutions (including at least two from the TEC system).
4. Four CHE staff members.

The task force would be organized into three task groups, each comprised of two lay citizens, one legislator, three institutional representatives, and one CHE staff member. Each task group would be responsible for studying and developing proposed policies with regard to one of the three recommendations assigned to the task force. Responsibility for coordination of the three areas under study, and development of final proposed policies will remain with the entire Task Force on Standards.

C. Staff Resources - Four staff members, one to serve on and staff each task group and one additional to serve on and staff the task force and coordinate the work of the three that are staffing the task groups.

D. Time Frame - An interim report will be made to a seminar or work session of CHE members by November 1, 1986.

III. Task Force on Excellence (Attachment 3)

A. Purpose - to study and make recommendations concerning research, quality initiatives, and scholarships for bright students. This task force will have responsibility for the following AVA recommendations:

1. Recommendation 7 (Funding of Research) - p.94.
2. Recommendation 8 (Quality Initiatives) - p.96.
3. Recommendation 9 (Scholarship Funds) - p.96.

B. Membership and Organization

1. Six lay citizens, one of whom will serve as chairperson.
2. Three members of the General Assembly.
3. Nine institutional representatives, seven from the public sector institutions (at least one representing TEC), and two from the private institutions.
4. Four CHE staff members.

The task force would be organized into three task groups, each comprised of two lay citizens, one legislator, three institutional representatives, and one CHE staff member. Each task group would be responsible for studying and developing proposed policies with regard to one of the three recommendations assigned to the task force. Responsibility for coordination of the three areas under study, and development of proposed policies will remain with the entire Task Force on Excellence.

- C. Staff Resources - Four staff members, one to serve and staff each task group and one additional to serve on and staff the task force and coordinate the work of the three that are staffing the task groups.
- D. Time Frame - An interim report will be made to a seminar or work session of CHE members by November 1, 1986.

IV. Task Force on Transfer and Interinstitutional Cooperation (Attachment 4)

A. Purpose - to study and make recommendations concerning transfer policies, a common academic calendar, and interinstitutional cooperation. This task force will have responsibility for the following AVA recommendations:

1. Recommendation 3 (Transfer of Credit) - p.37.
2. Recommendation 6-1 (Common Academic Calendar) - p.92.
3. Recommendation 6-2 (Interinstitutional Cooperation) - p.92.

3. Membership and Organization

1. Four lay citizens, one of whom will serve as chairman.
2. Two members of the General Assembly.
3. Four institutional representatives, two representing the TEC system, one representing the USC system, and one representing the remaining public senior colleges.
4. One CHE staff member.

This task force will meet as a "committee of the whole".

- C. Staff Resources - One staff member to serve on and organize and coordinate the work of the task force.
- D. Time Frame - An interim report will be made to a seminar or work session of CHE members by November 1, 1986.

V. Task Force on Strengthening the Commission through Legislation
(Attachment 5)

A. Purpose - to study and make recommendations for statutory changes that would strengthen the Commission on Higher Education. This task force will have responsibility for the following AVA recommendations:

1. Recommendation 11 (Legislation on Program Approval) - p.101.
2. Recommendation 16-3 (Authority over Tuition Grants) - p.107
3. Recommendation 19 (Appointment of Commission Members) - p.109.

B. Membership and Organization

1. Four lay citizens, one of whom will sit as chairman.
2. Four members of the General Assembly, two representing the House and two representing the Senate. It is recommended that these members be appointed from the respective education, finance, and/or judiciary committees.

3. Three members of the Commission.
 4. Three representatives of the public colleges and universities.
 5. Three representatives of the private colleges and universities.
 6. One CHE staff member.
- C. Staff Resources - One staff member to serve on and organize and coordinate the work of the task force.
- D. Time Frame - Recommendations to be made to a seminar or work session of CHE members by November 15, 1986, with final recommendations to the Commission at the December meeting.

VI. Commission Self-Study Task Force (Attachment 6)

- A. Purpose - to study and make recommendations to increase the effectiveness of the Commission, and to define its planning, policy, and leadership role in guiding the future development of higher education in the State. This task force will have responsibility for the following AVA recommendations:
1. Recommendation 10 (CHE Visibility) - p.99.
 2. Recommendation 12 (Emphasis on Planning) - p.101.
 3. Recommendation 13 (Review of Accomplishments and Identification of Emerging Issues) - p.102.
 4. Recommendation 15 (Advisory Groups) - p.106.
 5. Recommendation 16 (Private Sector - Communication and Involvement in Planning) - p.107.
 6. Recommendation 17 (Liaison with Council of Presidents - Public) - p.108.
 7. Recommendation 18 (Liaison with State Board of Education and SBTCE) - p.109.
 8. Recommendation 20 (Amendment of CHE Rules and Procedures) - p.111.

9. Recommendation 21 (CHE Staff Director's Title) - p.112.
 10. Recommendation 22 (CHE Staff's Administrative Experience) - p.112.
- B. Membership and Organization
1. Three members of the Commission.
 2. Three members of the Commission staff.
 3. Four outside members, very familiar with the Commission (e.g., former Commission members, former staff members, or former public college administrators) one of whom will serve as chairperson.
- C. Staff Resources - Three staff members to serve on the Task Force.
- D. Time Frame - Appointments to be made immediately. Recommendations have natural priorities (e.g., title of chief executive officer needs immediate decision). Recommendations submitted directly to the Commission, sometimes through working sessions when they appear to require considerable discussion.

General Note: AVA Recommendation 5 (Approval of New Graduate Programs) should be handled by the traditional process in Academic Affairs (i.e., the Advisory Committee of Academic Vice Presidents, the Standing Committee on Academic Affairs, and the Commission). The procedures incorporated in this recommendation are currently being followed; any minor modifications needed can be handled without study by a special task force.

A. Recommendations related to the development of a continuing Statewide and institutional process for planning and quality assessment.

1. Recommendation 1A (Definition of Quality) - p. 79.

The Commission on Higher Education should make the assessment of the quality of higher education a major objective for the coming years. As a first step, the Commission, in cooperation with the state's colleges and universities, should define quality.

2. Recommendation 1B (Institutional Plans for Quality) - p. 79.

Second, the Commission should identify the major components of an academic plan and require each public institution to develop such a plan.

3. Recommendation 1C (Institutional Procedures for Quality Assessment) - p. 79.

Third, institutions should create their own procedures for assessing academic performance.

4. Recommendation 1D (Standard Procedures for Quality Assessment) p. 79.

Finally, drawing on institutional efforts, the Commission should develop its own procedures for a statewide assessment of quality.

5. Recommendation 14 (Mission Statements and Institutional Profiles) p. 105.

Institutional mission statements should be periodically reviewed by the Commission on Higher Education to ensure a continued fit between state-level goals and the aggregate activities of the state's colleges and universities. The Commission should also require that institutional profiles be appended to mission statements and that each college and university provide the Commission with a summary of its academic and facilities plans.

3. Recommendations concerning standards for developmental education, admissions, and student readiness for upper division study.

1. Recommendation 2 (Entrance Requirements) - p. 86.

The Commission on Higher Education should set minimal college and university entrance criteria. These criteria should be differentiated among three groups of institutions: (1) Clemson University, the Medical University and the University of South Carolina at Columbia; (2) four-year public colleges and all other campuses of the University of South Carolina; and (3) the technical colleges.

2. Recommendation 4 (Developmental Education) - p. 89.

The Commission on Higher Education should establish state-wide developmental education policies that would guide the provision and funding of academic activities at less than the freshman level. No degree credit should be awarded for developmental work.

3. Recommendation 3 (Student Assessment) - p. 87.

The Commission on Higher Education should develop and implement criteria for assessing students' readiness for upper division study. Students should meet such criteria in order to: (1) enter the upper division of a public institution; . . . and (3) be eligible to receive student financial aid under the Tuition Grants Program as an upper division student enrolled in a private college.

C. Recommendations concerning the funding of excellence through quality initiatives, scholarships for gifted students, and stronger research efforts.

1. Recommendation 7 (Funding of Research) - p. 94.

The Commission on Higher Education should seek additional state funding, beyond the matching funds currently provided in the formula, in order to expand the research capacity of the state's universities. The Commission should allocate some of these funds to support endowed faculty chairs and some through a competitive grant process designed to stimulate research or research capacity in areas of specific state interest.

2. Recommendation 8 (Quality Initiatives) - p. 96.

The Commission on Higher Education should request that the General Assembly establish a program to distribute funds to support the improvement of higher education. The program should be administered by the Commission.

3. Recommendation 9 (Scholarship Funds) - p. 96.

The Commission on Higher Education should request that the General Assembly establish a scholarship program designed to identify and recognize South Carolina's brightest students and to encourage them to enroll in the state's colleges and universities. The program should be administered by the Commission on Higher Education.

D. Recommendations concerning transfer of credit, a common academic calendar, and interinstitutional cooperation.

1. Recommendation 3 (Transfer of Credit) - p. 87.

The Commission on Higher Education should develop and implement criteria for assessing students' readiness for upper division study. Students should meet such criteria in order to: . . . (2) transfer lower division course credits between institutions; . . .

2. Recommendation 6-1 (Common Academic Calendar) - p. 92.

The Commission on Higher Education should work toward improving interinstitutional cooperation through the encouragement of such efforts as a common postsecondary academic calendar.

3. Recommendation 6-2 (Interinstitutional Cooperation) - p. 92.

Establishment of interinstitutional advisory groups to promote research, faculty and student exchanges, complementary graduate program offerings, and international study opportunities. In the case of technical and academic colleges located near one another, the technical college should only provide those academic courses required of all technical college students or those courses designed as non-transfer courses to support a specific technological emphasis.

E. Recommendations to strengthen the Commission through statutory changes.

1. Recommendation 11 (Legislation on Program Approval) - p. 101.

The Commission's authorizing legislation should be amended to give the Commission sole responsibility and final authority to approve new programs and terminate existing programs.

2. Recommendation 16-3 (Budget and Policy Approval Authority over Tuition Grants) - p. 107.

Relations between the Commission on Higher Education and South Carolina's private colleges should be strengthened in three ways:

3) the Commission should have budget and policy approval authority over the Tuition Grants Program.

3. Recommendation 19 (Appointment of Commission Members) p. 109.

Members of Commission on Higher Education should be appointed by the governor with the consent of the General Assembly. Members of the Commission should serve for six years. Commission members should be thoroughly oriented to their public policy role and provided periodic seminars designed to keep them up-to-date on current issues.