

MINUTES OF MEETING  
OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

April 7, 1977  
10:30 a.m. - 4:15 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  
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  
Mr. T. Emmet Walsh

STAFF

Mr. Charles A. Brooks  
Mrs. Clara W. Evans  
Dr. George P. Fulton  
Mr. William C. Jennings  
Dr. Frank E. Kinard  
Mr. Alan S. Krech  
Mr. Cannon R. Mayes  
Mr. James R. Michael  
Mr. John J. Powers  
Mr. James L. Solomon, Jr.  
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett

GUESTS

Mr. Lynn W. Beasley  
Dr. Charles B. Bobo  
Mr. Joe B. Davenport  
Dr. Keith E. Davis  
Mr. G. William Dudley, Jr.  
Mr. Clair Huntington  
Mr. Joseph Jenkins  
Mr. L. Roger Kirk  
Dr. William B. McCurdy  
Mr. J. Lacy McLean  
Dr. J. Cordell Maddox  
Mr. Andy Maloney  
Mr. P. C. Smith  
Dr. S. Thomas Scarborough  
Dr. Arnold E. Schwartz

MEMBER OF THE PRESS

Ms. Warren McInnis

I. Approval of Minutes of March 11, 1977, Commission Meeting

It was moved (Shirley) and seconded (Forbes) that the minutes of the March 11, 1977, Commission meeting be approved as written. The motion was adopted.

Dr. Smith noted that those minutes contain two references to the fact that the Commission planned to meet again on March 12 (minutes of March 11, 1977, meeting, p. 278). He suggested that the wording of the title "Ratification of Actions Taken on March 12, 1977" on the agenda for April 7 and the corresponding enclosure be changed to read "Consideration of Matters Discussed and Ratification of Actions Taken by the Executive Committee on March 16, 1977." He suggested further that the first sentence of the first paragraph of that enclosure be revised to read, "At an informal session on March 12, 1977, the Commission suggested the following guidance for the Executive Committee." It was moved (Burns) and seconded (Colvin) that the title and first sentence of that document be revised as stated above, and that the minutes reflect those changes. The motion was adopted.

II. Consideration of Matters Discussed and Ratification of Action Taken by the Executive Committee on March 16, 1977

Dr. Smith stated that, following the Commission meeting at The Citadel on March 11, the Commission met in Charleston on March 12 in an informal session with the presidents of the public senior colleges and universities. At that meeting the Commission suggested the following guidance for the Executive Committee, with the understanding that motions to confirm this guidance would be presented at the Commission meeting on April 7:

"1. As soon as possible the Executive Committee will present to appropriate bodies in the General Assembly a recommendation that in Section 4 of the Lake Committee Bills (S.251, H.2183) the moratorium on expansion and construction be amended to ensure that essential activities can be carried on.

"2. The Commission opposes the proposed amendment to Section 124, 1977-78 Appropriation Bill, relating to faculty members teaching a minimum of twelve clock hours each semester and related requirements."

Item 1 was discussed by the Executive Committee in a telephone conference on March 16, and the matter was brought to the attention of appropriate bodies in the General Assembly on March 17 by a letter from Dr. Smith to Senator Robert C. Lake, Jr.; Senator Harry A. Chapman, Chairman of the Senate Education Committee; and Representative Nick A. Theodore, Chairman of the House Education and Public Works Committee (Exhibit A). Dr. Smith asked the Commission to officially approve or disapprove the action of the Executive Committee at this time.

It was moved (Burns) and seconded (Walsh) that the Commission approve the letters of March 17, 1977, to Senators Lake and Chapman and Representative Theodore from Dr. Smith. Mr. Walsh stated that, while he concurred, the intent of the Lake Committee Bills (S.251, H.2183) as they are presently worded provide for emergency construction and expansion. He noted that the phrase "to satisfy pressing local needs" might be misinterpreted, and that it might be more appropriate to say "to satisfy existing needs of any public institution."

Mr. Shirley stated that in his view the present wording of the bills provides sufficient flexibility to meet emergency situations. Mr. Quattlebaum stated that the presidents were concerned primarily about the time element involved in obtaining the approval of the Commission and the Budget and Control Board. Dr. Smith requested that Mr. Michael discuss the Commission's position on this matter personally with appropriate members of the General Assembly. Mr. Michael indicated that he would do so. The motion was adopted.

Dr. Smith stated that subsequent to the telephone conference on March 16 concerning Item 2 (the proposed amendment to Section 124 of the Appropriation Bill relating to faculty members teaching a minimum of twelve clock hours each semester), a number of the presidents discussed the matter with members of the General Assembly. The proposed amendment was later deleted from the Appropriation Bill. Dr. Smith requested that the Commission approve the guidance for the Executive Committee concerning Item 2, for the record. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Colvin) that the guidance for the Executive Committee be approved. The motion was adopted.

Mr. McAlister noted that the following motion was presented at the meeting in Charleston on March 12:

"In Section 2 [of the Lake Committee Bills (S.251, H.2183)], modify the proposed composition of the Commission so as to include retention of the ex officio members with the provision that each may not vote on matters directly affecting the institution(s) he represents." The motion was defeated five to four.

Since Messrs. Colvin and Walsh were not present at the meeting on March 12 under the impression that no business would be conducted, their votes were obtained by the Chairman. Details concerning these actions were transmitted to the Commission by a memorandum, dated March 21, 1977, from the Chairman.

Mr. McAlister noted that this matter was not included on the list of actions taken on March 12, 1977, transmitted by Mr. Michael's memorandum of March 30 to the Commission. He suggested that the motion quoted above be revised as stated below, for the consideration of the appointed members of the Commission:

"In Section 2, modify the proposed composition of the Commission so as to include retention of the ex officio members with the provision that they may not vote."

Mr. Walsh raised the point of order that this item was not on the agenda of the meeting and that the Commission therefore should not consider it at this time. Mr. Marchant inquired as to the reason the action was not included on the list of actions taken as a third item, and expressed the view that the Commission should approve that action also. Mr. McAlister noted that the Executive Committee took no action on the matter.

Dr. Smith stated that the Executive Committee did not take action because the ex officio members did not participate in the "straw poll" taken on March 12. The vote of the appointed members was three in favor and three opposing, with Dr. Smith casting the deciding vote in favor. He later talked with Messrs. Colvin and Walsh who were not present on March 12. Both indicated that, had they been present, they would have cast negative notes, thereby defeating the issue four to five. Dr. Smith asked for a parliamentary ruling. Mr. Marchant stated that the subject would come under approval of the minutes of the meeting of March 11.

Mr. Walsh stated that the Commission agreed at an open meeting on March 11 that no action would be taken at the informal session on March 12, and that the Commission had violated its own agreement. He stated that the action was highly irregular. He noted that the two items on the list of actions taken were actions of the Executive Committee rather than the full Commission.

Mr. McAlister stated that he saw nothing irregular about bringing the matter up, in spite of the "straw poll" vote on March 12. He requested that he be permitted to bring the matter up as new business for the consideration of the appointed members. It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (McAlister) that the matter be included on the agenda for action at this time.

Mr. Clement noted that the Chairman had explained carefully in Charleston on March 12 that, although the action of the Commission was irregular, the Executive Committee would discuss it further by telephone and the Commission would be governed accordingly. He stated that he could not understand why the agenda should be disrupted at this time to bring up the matter again, after it had been defeated on March 12.

Mr. Marchant stated that if the Commission reconsiders the matter, the institutional representatives will again ask to refrain from voting, the gubernatorial appointees will not approve the motion, and the question is therefore academic.

Mr. McAlister stated that, from a practical standpoint, if the Commission desires to retain the ex officio members, it must be done at this time. He noted that if the ex officio members were retained, the composition of the Commission, as recommended by the Lake Committee, would be modified to include two members from each congressional district, resulting in an 18-member Commission.

Mr. Colvin stated that in his view, since the matter was one of the three items acted upon on March 12, it would not be out of order to discuss it further at this time. It was moved (Clement) and seconded (Marchant) that the proposed composition of the Commission be modified to include retention of the ex officio members, with the provision that they may not vote. Mr. Walsh stated that the matter was not on the agenda and the motion, therefore, was out of order.

A substitute motion was made (Quattlebaum) and seconded (McAlister) that the Commission vote on the matter of whether or not the rules should be suspended concerning the introduction of new business on the agenda. The motion was approved, with Mr. Walsh casting a dissenting vote.

The original motion was amended (Burns) and seconded (Scarborough) to provide that each ex officio member may not vote on matters directly affecting the institution(s) he represents. In response to an inquiry by Mr. Marchant, Dr. Smith stated that both gubernatorial appointees and ex officio members might vote on the motion. Mr. Walsh objected. He noted that Commission members have had a number of opportunities to make their views known, and that it would be unwise at this time for the Commission to take a position on the matter. He expressed the view that coordination of higher education in South Carolina is not contingent upon the composition of the Commission. He noted that individual members of the Commission have the right to communicate with members of the General Assembly concerning this subject, based on their experience. Mr. Shirley agreed.

Mr. Clement noted that he had stated at the meeting in Charleston on March 11 that in his opinion it was most indelicate for the Commission to officially bring this matter before the Lake Committee at a public hearing. He stated that he would be willing to go along with a compromise, if necessary, but that he would oppose the amended motion. Mr. Burns stated that since he has been a member of the Commission, as an ex officio member representing Winthrop College, he has never voted on any matter directly involving Winthrop, because in his opinion that would be an inconsistent position and an adverse interest. He stated that the amended motion would remove any adverse interest.

It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Stanback) that the amended motion be tabled. The motion was approved, with eight voting in favor and three opposing. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Shirley) that the original motion be tabled. The motion was approved, with six voting in favor and four opposing.

### III. Briefing by Director, Office of State Planning

The Chairman introduced Mr. P. C. Smith, Director of State Planning. Mr. Smith stated that State Government in South Carolina, as in most states, has grown rapidly in the past few years, resulting in a much more complex situation than has existed before in the State. The Budget and Control Board is aware of its

own position in this function and is concerned as to its effectiveness in the management of State Government. As a result, the Board has embarked on a program of self-evaluation to determine ways in which it can more efficiently discharge its own responsibilities. Specific areas of concern have been identified, and the Board is moving toward procedures relating to specific areas of responsibility.

One of the primary responsibilities of the Board is the presentation of the budget to the Legislature each year. A major problem associated with the budgeting responsibility has been to identify the programs and services to be financed, which has been done on an annual cycle. This program and service aspect of budgeting is repeated each year. The Board believes that its effectiveness can be improved if it looks farther ahead than one year into the future. He stated that five years seems to be a reasonable time frame for a projection on which to begin this planning program. The Board is asking twelve of the largest agencies in State Government to join with it in developing a procedure for a five-year plan for each agency, in its own area of responsibility. It is anticipated that the plan will be updated each year in order to continue projecting five years into the future. He noted that the Board hopes to relate the plan as much as practicable to the budget cycle. He commented that, since the Commission on Higher Education already has entered into a planning procedure, adjusting to conform to the Budget and Control Board's program would be relatively simple. He requested, on behalf of the Board, that the Commission join with it as one of the twelve agencies which have been selected to inaugurate the project. Eventually the procedure will be extended to every agency in the State.

Mr. Clement stated that in his view it is the responsibility of the Commission, rather than of the institutions, to make a five-year projection of the kinds of educational services that should be available in the State. He noted that he had stated in Charleston on March 11 and wished to reiterate his understanding that the Commission should be primarily concerned with philosophy, policy, and academic programs, as they relate to education; instead it has become involved to a great degree with finances.

Mr. McAlister stated that his view of the Budget and Control Board's request is for the Commission to develop planning procedures for a method of making a five-year projection. Mr. Walsh stated that in his view the request of the Budget and Control Board will fit in very well with what the Commission has done in the past few years and what it is in the process of doing at this time as mandated by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, that of evaluating programs and need, and in order to do so it is also necessary to consider the financial resources of the State. He noted that the institutions have been most cooperative in working with the Commission and in providing the data necessary for the studies underway by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Swanson asked if the Board would expect the plan to be submitted concurrently with the budget for the coming year. Mr. Smith stated that the hope is that the plan will have as much impact on next year's budget as possible, but that the Board will be in a better position to recognize the benefits of the project in the fall of 1978.

The Chairman noted that the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission will consider a number of reports at its June 2 meeting. He stated that the Commission on Higher Education conducted a study and published a report in 1972 which set forth the educational needs of the State to 1980. He agreed that it would not be difficult to mesh the studies presently underway by the Commission with the

Board's proposed five-year plan, and assured Mr. Smith that the Commission will cooperate fully with the Budget and Control Board in this project.

IV. Report on FY 1977 Funding of Title VI-A Applications (Undergraduate Educational Equipment)

Mr. Solomon stated that Mr. Michael had communicated with the Commission by memorandum dated March 30, 1977 (Exhibit B), regarding the implementation of procedures set forth in the State Plan for Title VI-A for funding of 1977 projects. He noted that the memorandum included a listing of institutions that qualified for funding under these procedures and the amount of federal share for which they were being recommended. Funding was recommended for 11 of 33 Category I applications. He noted that the sixth-ranked application was not recommended for funding because maintenance of effort was not met.

In response to a question by Mr. Burns, Mr. Solomon stated that qualification criteria for funding is based on an institution's accreditation or candidacy status by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). A candidate is an institution which has an official relationship with and is considered by SACS to be progressing normally toward accreditation. In addition, an institution must meet maintenance of effort standards. Once these basic criteria have been met, there are specific standards set forth in the State Plan which enable the staff to develop the priority ranking. Dr. Smith stated that no action by the Commission is required.

V. Recommendations for FY 1977 Funding of Title I-A Proposals (Community Service and Continuing Education)

In the absence of Mr. Howe, chairman of the Committee on Facilities and Federal Programs, Mr. Burns reported that the Advisory Council for Title I-A HEA of 1965 reviewed the preliminary proposals and selected 15 for development as formal proposals. On February 18, 1977, the Advisory Council met in Columbia to consider these 15 proposals and to recommend those to be funded with the available \$148,148. The recommendations of the Advisory Council were reported to the Commission by memorandum dated March 30, 1977, from Mr. Michael (Exhibit C). The committee requested that the Commission approve the recommendations of the Advisory Council, as set forth in Exhibit C. It was moved (Burns) and seconded (Quattlebaum) that the recommendations of the Advisory Council be approved. The motion was adopted.

VI. Discussion of Tuition Grants Program

Dr. Smith suggested that the discussion of the Tuition Grants Program be deferred to the June 2, 1977, meeting of the Commission. Mr. Michael noted that a planning study on this program would be presented to the Commission at that meeting, and it would be appropriate for the Commission to discuss the subject at that time.

VII. Presentation of Needs Assessment for Eye Care Services

Dr. Fulton stated that the staff work on optometric education consists of four phases:

- (1) Work with the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and counterparts in higher education in Georgia and North Carolina resulting in the development of the concept of a regional school, cooperative program, and a model for sharing of costs (capital and operating).



(2) Development of an interstate financial plan and acceptance by the Interstate Planning Committee in January, 1977, and endorsement by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education to be sent to the Medical University of South Carolina.

(3) Staff work, at the request of the Commission, to assess the need in South Carolina, resulting in the report of the Committee on Need. This report reveals the struggles of the optometric profession to up-grade itself, to locate a school in a medical complex, to solve the need for continuing education, and to sustain itself and provide opportunities for young South Carolinians to study optometry in view of diminishing entry points in the South, with Southern College at Memphis cutting back on admissions. There are sufficient opportunities to study ophthalmology in the three states, but none of the three provide in-state opportunities to study optometry. The report also reveals the need to provide services for many citizens who are presently unserved, especially preschool and early school children, as many as 150,000 in South Carolina. Finally, the report reveals the need to have an intellectual and academic advanced study center to resolve the problems between the professions. This report, compiled and assembled by the health affairs staff of the Commission on behalf of the Committee on Need, was accepted by 15 members of the committee, one abstaining and one opposing.

(4) The staff is engaged in analyses and research work to assist in the preparations required for the Commission to make a decision concerning approval of a specific application for a school of optometry that is anticipated from the Medical University. The proposal would come from MUSC and present details of curriculum, cost, and numbers of students. The Health Education Authority will be involved in providing professional advice. The staff will reintroduce the report of the third consultant, an expert on optometric education. This report was submitted early in the review process, and has been updated recently in the light of the needs assessment. The Commission should now turn to MUSC for completion of this phase of the study consisting of the transmittal of specific cost estimates.

Dr. Fulton introduced Mr. Joe B. Davenport, Chairman of the Task Force on Optometric Education. Dr. Fulton expressed appreciation to Mr. Davenport for his volunteer services to health care in South Carolina provided over the past several years, for his active membership on the Health Education Authority, and for his work with the Lions Club and the Statewide Health Coordinating Council in the new national program of Health Systems Agencies. Mr. Davenport presented the Report of the Task Force on Optometric Education, which is attached as Exhibit D.

Dr. Smith expressed appreciation, on behalf of the Commission, for the work done by Mr. Davenport, other members of the Task Force on Optometric Education, and the various committees working on the optometric project. Mr. Burns stated that he is indebted to the Task Force and the staff for their efforts in compiling the report of the Committee on Need, which in his opinion is an invaluable piece of investigative work. Mr. Shirley urged all members of the Commission to read the report.

Dr. Smith introduced Dr. Charles B. Bobo, who represented Dr. Bland as a member of the Task Force on Optometric Education. Dr. Bobo stated that while he believes the report of the Committee on Need contains some factual material, it also contains information which he believes might be slanted. He indicated that he would rebut each of the conclusions drawn by the committee (pp. 6-11 of the report of the Committee on Need). His remarks are attached as Exhibit E.

Mr. Burns quoted a statement made by Dr. John W. Irwin, a visiting consultant from the Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary. In his report of March 20, 1977, to the Liaison Committee on the Interrelationships of Ophthalmology and Optometry, Dr. Irwin said: "Ophthalmologists should diagnose and treat eye disease. They may wish to do refractions, but under no condition should they fit and sell glasses overtly or covertly." Mr. Burns asked Dr. Bobo if he dispensed glasses. Dr. Bobo stated that, when he entered the practice of ophthalmology, he made the decision to fit glasses in order to have control over the glasses he prescribes and to make certain the job is done properly.

Dr. Smith inquired concerning the percentage of ophthalmologists in South Carolina who dispense glasses. Dr. Bobo indicated that approximately half the ophthalmologists in the State dispense glasses. He noted that most of those in urban areas do not, while most in rural areas do. In response to this inquiry from the Chairman, Dr. Scarborough stated that all except two ophthalmologists in Charleston dispense glasses.

Mr. Burns again quoted from the report submitted by Dr. Irwin: "On March 21, 1977, the Task Force on Optometric Education met. During this session the same debate continued. I concluded that economics was playing a large role in the arguments of both ophthalmologists and optometrists." When asked to comment on this, Dr. Bobo stated that, while it is true that both are vying for the same patient, he personally does not feel threatened by optometrists. He noted that he refers patients back to optometrists for glasses if they refer patients to him for medical treatment. Mr. Burns asked Dr. Bobo to explain the basis of his objection to the establishment of a training center for optometrists in South Carolina, if it would not concern ophthalmologists economically. Dr. Bobo stated that he does not believe a training center is needed, and that it would be an unnecessary expense to the State. Mr. Burns asked if his primary interest is the cost to the State. Dr. Bobo stated that one of his concerns is that optometry would be trying to up-grade its image to the public to that of a medical profession through the school's association with the Medical University.

At this point, Mrs. Forbes noted that one of the provisions for federal funding was that the school be associated with a large medical center in order to improve the quality of optometric education and to articulate optometry with the other health professions. Nevertheless, her previously expressed opinion has been reinforced by objections such as those raised by Dr. Bobo. She reiterated that the school might more appropriately be established at the University of South Carolina where the governance is regulated by a broad sector of society and not predominately by members of the medical profession. Mrs. Forbes pointed out that USC accommodates a variety of schools and colleges including a College of Nursing, a School of Public Health, a College of Pharmacy, and a new School of Medicine. In her opinion, a School of Optometry at USC might have a better chance to succeed, and the institutionalized patients in the Columbia area would provide a source for clinical training.

Mr. Burns asked Dr. Bobo why he is concerned about the profession of optometry being up-graded. Dr. Bobo stated that up-grading the image of optometry to that of a medical profession would be misleading the public. In response to an inquiry by Mr. Clement, Dr. Bobo stated that the same institution could not train both optometrists and ophthalmologists because ophthalmologists have medical degrees while optometrists have only two years of postgraduate training and could not, therefore, be trained at the same level.



Mr. Johnson noted that three ophthalmologists who have met with the Commission -- Dr. Bland, Dr. Stokes, and Dr. Bobo -- have indicated that economics is not a consideration in their objection to the establishment of the school, but that it would be more reasonable if they could admit that it is, in fact, an economic situation. Dr. Bobo stated that the health factor and the deception of the public concern him most of all. Mr. Johnson stated that the ophthalmologists have not raised objections about other State appropriations for higher education, nor have they suggested ways of saving State funds. Dr. Bobo reiterated that while economics is a concern, his basic concern is that optometrists might deceive the public.

Mr. Davenport read the new definition of optometry endorsed by DHEW contained in a memorandum dated April 6, 1977, from Dr. Henry B. Peters, Dean of the School of Optometry, Medical Center, University of Alabama (Exhibit F). Mr. Davenport stated that Dr. Bobo's remarks concerning under-utilization of optometrists are illogical, and that it is obvious to those who have read the materials provided by the staff that the patterns of practice of the two professions are entirely different. He objected to the statement that, because optometrists do not use as many assistants as ophthalmologists, and because they can schedule new patients in a shorter period of time, optometrists are not performing at the top of their capacity. Mr. Davenport stated that no correlation has been shown between the length of time it takes to schedule an appointment and how effectively a professional practices. He commented that if members of the two professions could put aside money and petty jealousies and make a genuine effort to serve the needs of the people of South Carolina, the work of the Task Force and the committees would be successful.

Dr. Smith introduced Dr. S. Thomas Scarborough, a member of the Liaison Committee on the Interrelationships of Ophthalmology and Optometry, and President of the South Carolina Optometric Association, who made a brief presentation (Exhibit G).

Mr. Burns stated that many of the problems between the two professions would be solved if both optometrists and ophthalmologists used dispensing opticians to handle the glasses. Dr. Scarborough agreed and noted that, contrary to Dr. Bobo's statement, "most optometrists have no assistants other than clerical," he employs five assistants in his office.

In response to Dr. Bobo's suggestion that more spaces could be obtained in schools in other states, Dr. William B. McCurdy stated that in his view prospective South Carolina students of optometry should not be sent out of state to be trained any more than prospective physicians or dentists should be trained elsewhere. He noted that the Commission approved the establishment of the school of dentistry at MUSC, and that ophthalmologists did not object. He expressed the opinion that eventually South Carolina will need to provide its own schools rather than continuing to depend on other states to provide them.

Mrs. Forbes recommended that every member of the Commission read Dr. Irwin's comprehensive report. She noted that he is neither an optometrist nor an ophthalmologist but a medical educator and research investigator based in a leading vision care institution. Mr. Shirley stated that he will reread the report and other materials, study both viewpoints further, and weigh all factors carefully before making a decision. He stated that in his opinion a strong case could be made for each side. He complimented Dr. Fulton for the research that was done in making the study of the Committee on Need.

Dr. Smith stated that the Board of Trustees at MUSC has requested that the Commission act on the report of the Committee on Need before MUSC proceeds with the preparation of a financial plan. He noted that this is only one in a series of decisions that must be made before the Commission determines its final position concerning the establishment of a tri-state school of optometry.

It was moved (Colvin) and seconded (Johnson) that the report of the Committee on Need be recommended to the Board of Trustees of the Medical University of South Carolina, along with the minutes of the April 7 Commission meeting, the minority report, and other supporting data. Mr. Burns stated that the Commission would actually be transmitting the report rather than recommending it.

Mr. Johnson requested that the consensus of the Commission be conveyed to the Board of Trustees of MUSC that transmittal of these materials not be construed by the Medical University as non-supportive or supportive of the need. Mr. Colvin stated that it would be strictly an approval of transmittal of the report as a device for assisting MUSC in its studies. Dr. Smith suggested that MUSC also be advised that the Commission requires specific information on the cost factors before making a decision concerning need.

Dr. Smith restated the motion: "that the report of the Task Force (majority and minority components) be transmitted to the Medical University along with the assessment of need, all supporting data, and the minutes containing a full account of the comments and discussion, and that the Medical University be requested to prepare and send back an estimate of the financial commitments that the development of a regional school of optometry would entail." The motion was adopted, with no dissenting votes. (Nine members were present at the time the vote was taken.)

Dr. Bobo requested that he be permitted to review the transcription of his statement before it is mailed to the Commission and the Medical University. Dr. Smith indicated that this would be done.

#### VIII. Other Business

Mr. Michael distributed a summary of 1977-78 appropriations, as passed by the Senate Finance Committee (Exhibit H).

Dr. Smith reported that Mr. Howe was in a Charleston hospital where he recently had undergone surgery. He suggested that flowers be sent on behalf of the Commission. Mr. Michael stated that he would arrange for this to be done.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Gaylon Syrett  
Recording Secretary