

MINUTES OF MEETING  
OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

January 5, 1978  
10:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dr. R. Cathcart Smith, Chairman  
Mr. Howard L. Burns  
Mr. Arthur J. H. Clement  
Mrs. Wanda L. Forbes  
Mrs. Nancy D. Hawk  
Mr. Paul W. McAlister  
Dr. John M. Pratt  
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

MEMBER OF THE PRESS

Ms. Warren McInnis

GUESTS

Mr. Orin G. Briggs  
Dr. Cyril B. Busbee  
Ms. Patty Cole  
Mr. John M. Cooper  
Dr. Keith E. Davis  
Mr. William R. Dean  
Mr. G. William Dudley, Jr.  
Mr. Julian B. Gamble  
Mr. A. D. Hutto  
Dr. Larry A. Jackson  
Mr. L. Roger Kirk  
Mr. J. Lacy McLean  
Miss Frances H. Miller  
Dr. James R. Morris, Jr.  
Dr. W. Curtis Worthington, Jr.

STAFF

Mrs. Jan Barton  
Dr. Howard R. Boozer  
Mr. Charles A. Brooks, Jr.  
Dr. George P. Fulton  
Mr. William C. Jennings  
Dr. Frank E. Kinard  
Mr. Alan S. Krech  
Mr. Cannon R. Mayes  
Mrs. Lynn Metcalf  
Mr. James R. Michael  
Mrs. Ann Shelton  
Mr. James L. Solomon, Jr.  
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett

I. Minutes of December 8, 1977, Commission Meeting

It was moved (Stanback) and seconded (Prioleau) that the minutes of the December 8, 1977, Commission meeting be approved as written. The motion was adopted.

II. Consideration of Proposed Regulations to License Nonpublic Educational Institutions to Confer Degrees

Dr. Kinard stated that as required by the Administrative Procedures Act, and after publication of proposed regulations in the State Register and newspaper notices, the staff convened a public hearing on December 16 to consider comments relating to the Commission's Proposed Regulations to License Nonpublic Educational

Institutions to Confer Degrees. Although no outside parties elected to attend the hearing, written comments were considered and minutes were written (Exhibit A). The "Proposed Regulations" (Exhibit B) were slightly modified, primarily through changing the sequence of three sections in the text in response to concerns expressed in several letters from representatives of the proprietary sector. The modifications do not change the intent of the earlier draft of the regulations. The staff recommended that the Commission approve the revised regulations for promulgation and transmittal to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate.

It was moved (Shirley) and seconded (Pratt) that the Commission on Higher Education adopt and promulgate the Regulations for Licensing Nonpublic Educational Institutions to Confer Degrees as presented to the Commission on November 4 and as amended following a public hearing on December 16, in accordance with Act 176 of the 1977 Acts and Joint Resolutions of the General Assembly.

Dr. Smith introduced President William R. Dean of Southern Methodist College, who stated that he appreciated the assistance the Commission has given his institution in the past and the efforts of the Commission in developing the licensure legislation. He stated that in his view the regulations are fair, and that his only concern was that the Commission not interfere with the philosophical and religious views of Southern Methodist College or require changes in curriculum that might conflict with those views. Dr. Boozer stated that the intent of licensure is only to assure that institutions in South Carolina are bona fide institutions, that licensure should not be confused with accreditation, and that the licensing process will not violate the generally accepted principle of the separation of church and state.

President Dean introduced Mr. Julian B. Gamble, president of the Southern Methodist denomination which supports Southern Methodist College. Mr. Gamble stated his agreement with the intent of the regulations, expressed appreciation to the Commission for its efforts, and invited Commission members to visit the campus.

The motion that the Commission adopt and promulgate the Regulations for Licensing Nonpublic Educational Institutions to Confer Degrees, as stated above, was adopted.

### III. Progress Report on Study of the Greenville Technical College Request

Dr. Kinard reported that, following President Thomas E. Barton's presentation to the Commission on December 8, 1977, he visited Dr. Barton and his key staff members at Greenville Technical College on December 13. The purpose of the visit was to discuss the details of a proposal to be prepared by Dr. Barton for the Commission's consideration in furtherance of the plans he outlined on December 8, to offer the Commission staff's assistance to the College in defining the types of information required by the Commission, and to gain a better understanding of the extent of the planning already completed by members of the Greenville Technical College staff.

It was agreed that a detailed proposal for the Commission's consideration would be drawn up as soon as possible. Because some additional planning on the part of the institutional staff will be necessary, such a proposal may not be ready for consideration prior to the March meeting of the Commission.

Mrs. Hawk expressed concern about the amount of staff work and funds that go into the development of such a proposal before the Commission acts on it. She noted that there is a difference between a proposal for a new academic program at an existing senior institution and a proposal for an institution to become a four-year college, and that the proposals should be handled differently.

Mr. Burns stated that in his opinion the sequence is wrong, and that once the staff works with an institution in developing a proposal, the staff in effect becomes a part of that proposal. He stated that in his view the institution itself should develop the proposal for review by the staff, and the staff should simply present the facts to the Commission, rather than work cooperatively in the preparation of the proposal. Mr. Quattlebaum stated that it would be very difficult for a staff member to work with an institution on a proposal and remain unbiased.

Dr. Kinard stated that the staff does not assist the institutions in drafting proposals but raises questions that must be considered, such as examination of need. He stated that unless the staff has the opportunity to consult with the institutions during the process of development, the proposals received are almost always deficient. Dr. Boozer noted that the process outlined in the Commission's formal "Policy and Procedures Concerning New Programs," adopted by the Commission on May 1, 1975, is followed. The staff offers assistance to the institutions when letters of intent are received by raising the relevant questions, not by helping to provide the answers.

Dr. Boozer noted that the Commission adopted the following motion on December 8: "It was moved and seconded that the staff obtain additional information from Dr. Barton and SBTCE and report back to the Commission at a subsequent meeting." Dr. Boozer stated that Dr. Kinard's visit to Greenville Technical College on December 13 was in compliance with that motion. Mr. Burns stated that if it is a matter of fact gathering, he has no objection to the existing procedures; if it is a matter of suggesting the contents of the proposal itself, however, he would have reservations about whether or not the staff recommendation could be objective. Mrs. Hawk stated that Commission members should participate in the development of a proposal at the beginning of the process rather than at the end when their action is to approve or disapprove. She stated that she had understood that facts only, rather than a proposal, would be presented to the Commission concerning Greenville Technical College, and that the philosophy, and not the particular programs, was important.

Mr. Clement asked at what point in the process Commission members will have the opportunity to provide alternative suggestions. Dr. Smith stated that the matter probably will be on the agenda at the March meeting and that the information obtained by the staff will be provided to Commission members prior to that meeting. He stated that no action by the Commission was necessary at this time.

#### IV. Progress Report on the Computerization of the Management Information System

Mr. Jennings stated that his first assignment as a member of the Commission's staff in 1969 was to develop a Management Information System (MIS). The Commission lacked reliable and uniform data at that time relating to higher education in South Carolina. Members of the staff met with representatives from the public colleges and universities and agreed upon a procedure to establish

a Management Information System. An MIS Working Committee, composed of institutional representatives, was appointed, and a Computer Advisory Committee was formed to coordinate the development of an adequate computer network to support the administrative and academic needs of the public colleges and universities in the State. Both committees are still active and are chaired by Mr. Jennings.

After adoption of uniform definitions, reporting dates, and report formats, a full range of CHE Reports was established, covering students, faculty, staff, revenue and expense, space utilization, etc., all prepared on a manual basis. By late 1971 it became evident that further substantial progress in MIS development would require computerization, and that a full-time computer professional would also expedite expansion of the computer network.

After two years of efforts to obtain authorization for the new position and to find its first incumbent, Mr. Charles A. Brooks, Jr., former assistant director of administrative data processing at the University of Georgia, was employed on the Commission staff as Coordinator of MIS Computerization.

Mr. Brooks reported on progress in MIS computerization since he joined the CHE staff in late 1973. He stated that his first activity was to visit the campuses of each of the public colleges and universities to determine the best approach to computerization. A report prepared by Mr. Brooks and distributed in February, 1974, to Commission members and presidents of the institutions made three major recommendations: 1. complete the evolution of regional computer centers to support the academic and administrative needs of South Carolina's public colleges and universities; 2. develop a computerized institutional information base and reporting system to support each institution's internal and external reporting requirements (including CHE Reports); 3. develop a State level information base and reporting system to support the Commission's reporting and planning requirements.

The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) had been working with approximately 300 institutions across the country to define the elements which should be included in a Management Information System for an institution of higher education. Using the NCHEMS report as a model for South Carolina, in 1974 committees were formed which were concerned with students, courses, faculty and staff, finance, and facilities. Through the work of these committees, a Data Element Dictionary was developed which defines the standardized data reporting system to be used by the institutions. This dictionary has been adopted by all the public colleges and universities in the State. Mr. Brooks also stated that each institution now has access by terminal to one of the major computer centers at Clemson, USC, or MUSC. This capability enables them to offer compatible computer programming courses and gives them the computing power needed for administrative and reporting purposes.

Also in 1974, state level coordinators requested that NCHEMS develop a state level information base for use by states in their reporting and planning activities and to make possible the sharing of compatible data among states. By the fall of 1976, a state level information base had been developed, along with a set of standard data elements and definitions. These data elements included information similar to that being obtained by the Commission from CHE and HEGIS Reports as well as information concerning state characteristics such

as elementary and secondary school enrollments, high school graduates, and state population. South Carolina is one of eight states taking part with NCHEMS in a pilot program to test the state level information base for reporting and planning purposes.

The Commission has contracted with the Computer Services Division of USC to provide programming and computer time to support South Carolina's information base. In June, 1977, programs to build and maintain the information base were completed. Programming to retrieve and report the data is underway. By means of a terminal in the Commission's office, data for fiscal 1976-77 have been processed and data for 1977-78 are now being added to the information base.

Mr. Burns inquired concerning cost to the Commission. Mr. Brooks stated that the annual cost is \$40,200, including programming time at USC and computer costs. Mr. Clement noted that the information base does not include data related to improving the product of higher education in the State, which in his opinion should have been the primary objective of the entire process. Mr. Brooks stated that while such data will be available ultimately, it was not included originally in the pilot tests because it was necessary first to evaluate the data to ascertain what should be added. Dr. Smith stated that it would be difficult to determine the value of a product such as the quality of education in simple terms in a short period of time. Mr. Burns stated that the Commission is much more limited in its ability to improve the quality of higher education than the general public believes, and that such a function is the responsibility of the board of trustees of each institution.

Mr. McAllister asked if the Commission soon will be capable of auditing the effectiveness of the use of funds by each institution from a cost basis. Mr. Brooks stated that both Clemson and USC have made cost analyses on a prior year by program and by course, and several of the colleges have indicated that they also plan to make cost analyses. Dr. Boozer noted that for the past two years, as the Commission considered appropriation requests, it has been provided computer reports concerning student/teacher ratios by discipline at each institution.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Stanback, Mr. Brooks stated that the staff assists the private institutions as they improve their computing capabilities. He noted that several private institutions have contracted with Clemson and USC for use of their computing facilities. Mr. Prioleau stated that the administrative staff at The Citadel is pleased with its terminals to USC. He commented that it would be very difficult for the Commission to assimilate all of the data and make decisions without computerization of the information.

#### V. Report of Executive Director

Dr. Boozer stated that he had been requested by Dr. Smith to make a brief presentation concerning the Commission's comprehensive, long-range planning effort. Since the Commission was created in 1967 as the State coordinating agency, planning was and has continued to be an important part of its function. A planning document, Goals for Higher Education to 1980 in South Carolina, was published in 1972. Dr. Boozer noted that in a subsequent analysis of statewide long-range plans over the country published in the period 1968-72, in terms of issues dealt with and the depth with which those issues were addressed, South Carolina's Goals for Higher Education . . . was outranked

by only five of the larger states in the nation. He stated, in response to comments heard from time to time that the "Goals Report" has not had a great impact, that under the law the Commission is not authorized in many areas to make decisions affecting higher education or to implement its recommendations.

Dr. Boozer stated that the Federal Higher Education Act of 1972 included amendments that encouraged the states to do more statewide planning in higher education, and provided for the creation of state planning commissions in postsecondary education. In order to meet the criteria required under the law, the Governor in 1974 designated the Commission on Higher Education, augmented by three additional members representing the public schools, the private colleges, and the proprietary schools, as the South Carolina Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. The Planning Commission in 1975 published an outline of the basic subjects that will be dealt with in comprehensive long-range planning. At its meeting on December 8, 1977, the Planning Commission authorized the publication of a report on goals of higher education in South Carolina, enrollment projections, and institutional missions. That report will be distributed before the end of January. In the staff's view, the essence of a master plan is contained in this document. Other studies will generate specific recommendations that will become additional elements of the master plan. Dr. Boozer noted that comprehensive long-range planning is a continuous process and that many studies will require frequent updating. A partial listing of reports and studies published by the Commission within the past two years follows:

An Inventory of Academic Degree Programs in South Carolina (2 editions)  
Inventory of Physical Facilities in South Carolina Postsecondary  
Institutions  
Degrees Conferred by Postsecondary Institutions in South Carolina  
Building Quality Evaluation Procedures Manual  
Assessment of Need for Vision Care Services and Optometric Education  
in South Carolina  
Resources of South Carolina Libraries  
Report of Task Force on Optometric Education to the South Carolina  
Commission on Higher Education  
Projected Degree-Credit Enrollments Through 1985 in South Carolina  
Colleges and Universities  
Policies of South Carolina Senior Colleges and Universities Concerning  
Transfer Students from Two-Year Colleges  
Nutritional Betterment Through Higher Education  
State of South Carolina Legal Documents Pertaining to Postsecondary  
Education (2 editions)  
Health Careers Directory (2 editions)  
Tuition and Fees in South Carolina Public Postsecondary Institutions,  
1976-77  
Comparison of Faculty Salary Averages in South Carolina Public Colleges  
and Universities With Faculty Salaries in Other Southern States  
Your Steps to Financial Aid (brochure)

Other publications scheduled for the near future include reports of planning conferences on nursing education and allied health and the report of a study of student financial aid. Reference was also made to a student aid "Impact Study" now underway under the auspices of the South Carolina College Council.

Mr. Quattlebaum suggested that the document, Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education in South Carolina: Goals, Enrollment Projections, and Institutional Missions, now in press, be summarized in pamphlet form for wide distribution. Dr. Smith complimented the staff on their work in producing these studies. It was moved (Shirley) and seconded (Forbes) that the Commission request permission to make a presentation concerning its planning activities to the Senate Education Committee and to the House Education and Public Works Committee. The motion was approved.

On motion made (Prioleau) and seconded (Shirley) and unanimously adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Gaylon Syrett  
Recording Secretary