

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

January 7, 1972
10:00 a. m. - 12:15 p. m.

PRESENT:

Mr. Hugh M. Chapman
Mr. T. Eston Marchant
Dr. Harrison L. Peeples
Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum
Mr. James A. Rogers
Mr. Fred R. Sheheen
Dr. R. Cathcart Smith
Mr. I. P. Stanback
Mr. E. Craig Wall, Chairman
Mr. T. Emmet Walsh

Dr. James A. Morris
Mr. William C. Jennings
Mr. James R. Michael
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Mr. Alan S. Krech

I. Approval of Minutes of December 2, 1971, Meeting of Commission on Higher Education

It was noted by Dr. Morris that there was a typographical error at the bottom of the second page of the minutes which states that Lander College is receiving from the state \$150,000 as a supplement for out-of-county students. The figure should have been \$100,000 and has been corrected in the original minutes. A motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Smith) that the minutes be approved subject to the correction of the figure \$150,000 to \$100,000. The motion was passed unanimously.

II. Introduction of Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum, New Commission Member

Mr. Wall introduced Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum to members of the Commission. Mr. Quattlebaum will represent the Clemson Board of Trustees on the Commission filling the vacancy created by the resignation of Mr. Oswald Lightsey.

III. Submission by Dr. Hugh H. Wells of Minority Report of Special Medical Education Committee

Dr. Wells submitted to Dr. Morris for distribution to members of the Special Medical Education Committee a minority report and cover letter in which he stated that the minority report spoke for himself and at least three other members of the committee. The minority report was not signed. In general discussion on the report it was pointed out that the Commission had accepted the report of the Special Medical Education Committee and an opportunity had been provided for a minority report to be submitted. Mr. Marchant disagreed stating that enough time had not been allowed between the approval of the final document and its submission to the Commission for a minority report to be written. A motion was made (Marchant) that the minority report written by Dr. Wells be accepted by the Commission, approved and adopted as a substitute conclusion to the report which was previously rendered. There was no second to the motion and no vote was taken. A motion was made (Peeples) and seconded (Sheheen) that the report by Dr. Wells be accepted as an opinion of Dr. Wells. The motion was passed. Mr. Marchant was opposed.

IV. Conference on Innovative Medical Education Sponsored by the Medical University of South Carolina

It was announced that Dr. Morris and Dr. Cathcart Smith have been invited to attend an Administrative Advisory Committee Conference on Innovative Medical Education sponsored by the Medical University at Hilton Head on February 11-13, 1972. A motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Stanback) that Dr. Morris and Dr. Smith be authorized to attend and participate in this conference. The motion was passed unanimously.

V. Article on Louisiana School of Medicine at Shreveport

Dr. Peeples issued to members of the Commission an article which appeared in "Notes and Tips", a publication of the American Medical Association, on the Louisiana School of Medicine at Shreveport. A motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Chapman) that the article be accepted as information. The motion was passed unanimously.

VI. Summary of Goals for Higher Education to 1980

In general discussion on the Summary of Goals for Higher Education to 1980 Mr. Walsh expressed his dissatisfaction with the report and the Summary. He stated that a lot of good conclusions had been reached but were not worded in such a way that would get them across effectively to the General Assembly. He was not pleased with the section on private higher education and after expressing his dissatisfaction had thought that the chapter would be rewritten. Mr. Walsh also thought the

chronology was wrong and that the crucial issues facing the state in higher education should be placed at the beginning of the report with more emphasis placed on them. It was felt by Mr. Walsh that the key issues were two-year post high school education, medical education, private higher education and more coordination of all higher education through the Commission. A list of all Commission members and their addresses should be included (this was already included in Volume I). Mr. Walsh stated that he would like for the Commission to have a chance to study the Summary, making suggestions to improve it, and setting it up in a format similar to the Carnegie Reports. Mr. Sheheen was in agreement with Mr. Walsh's views on the format of the report and Summary and also stated that he felt the most important recommendation was the recommendation dealing with more statutory authority for the Commission and the importance of having university and college budgets submitted to the Commission for transmittal to the Budget and Control Board. He added that these were seemingly lost in a mass of other recommendations of lesser importance. Mr. Sheheen further stated that he felt the major recommendations in the report were excellent and he was not arguing with the conclusions but felt the report in its present form was not the most effective promotional instrument for the recommendations.

A motion was made (Walsh) and seconded (Sheheen) that the Summary be revised to list at the beginning the four crucial issues: two-year post high school education, medical education, changes in statutory authority of the Commission and private higher education.

After discussion a substitute motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Peeples) that the report as far as format be approved and that Mr. Walsh and Mr. Sheheen be authorized to draft a cover letter outlining the points mentioned to be incorporated and made a part of the report after approval by the Executive Committee. The motion was passed. Mr. Walsh was opposed.

In connection with the recommendations in the "Goals" report Mr. Marchant commented that he strongly disagreed with the recommendation which states that statutory authority be amended to provide that the college and university budget submissions come to the Commission initially with open hearings being held by the Commission, which will make unified recommendations to the Budget and Control Board.

VII. Report of the Committee on Transfer of Credit from Technical Education Centers

The Committee to Study Transfer of Credit from Technical Education Centers to Public colleges and universities has submitted its report to the Commission. Basically the report concludes that all institutions of higher education should be

encouraged to accept associate degree credits from accredited technical education centers for appropriate courses when such courses are passed as acceptable for transfer of credit. The Committee will continue to operate, with the approval of the Commission, and attempt to improve the understanding between the colleges and universities and the technical education centers as to which credits are acceptable for transfer and which are not. A motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Sheheen) that the report from the Committee on Transfer of Credits and the philosophy expressed in the report be approved. The motion was passed unanimously. In general discussion it was suggested that the Commission could recommend to the Boards of Trustees of the individual institutions that they decide on an institutional basis if credit will be accepted and what credit. Mr. Krech will work out some draft recommendations in this connection for consideration by the Commission.

VIII. Resolution on Mr. E. Oswald Lightsey

A motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Stanback) that the resolution prepared in recognition of service to the Commission by Mr. E. Oswald Lightsey be approved. The motion was passed unanimously.

IX. Committee to Study Formula Budgeting System in Connection with Program Approvals

Pursuant to the request of the Commission at the December meeting Mr. Wall appointed the following members to a committee to study the feasibility of tying in program approvals with support of the formula budgeting system: Mr. Hugh Chapman, Chairman, Mr. Fred Sheheen, Mr. I. P. Stanback.

X. Prime Recommendation of Joint Committee on Two-Year Post High School Education

A motion was made (Sheheen) that the Commission call attention to the press and the public that the Commission on Higher Education approves the prime recommendation of the Joint Committee on Two-Year Post Secondary Education as the most desirable but agreed to reach a compromise that would be palatable to all of the people involved in the decision making, and also to point out the prime recommendation. A motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Smith) that Mr. Sheheen's motion be tabled. The motion was passed. Mr. Sheheen and Mr. Walsh were opposed.

XI. Program Considerations

Medical University of South Carolina
Post RN Certificate Program in Midwifery - Approved

South Carolina State College
BA in Art Education - Approved

University of South Carolina

B. S., M. S., and Ph. D. in Marine Science - A motion was made (Smith) and seconded (Stanback) that the B. S., M. S., and Ph. D. programs in Marine Science at the University of South Carolina be approved with the understanding that the Chairman of the Board or the President would provide a letter to the Commission pointing out specifically the kind of coordination which would occur between the University and other institutions in the state in Marine Science.

A substitute motion was made (Sheheen) and seconded (Walsh) that no graduate degree programs in Marine Studies be approved until the Commission assigns the principal responsibility for Marine Studies to a single institution or consortium, and that the Commission support graduate degree programs in Marine Studies in only one institution or consortium. The motion failed to carry.

A vote on Dr. Smith's motion was taken and the motion was passed. Mr. Sheheen and Mr. Walsh were opposed.

TEC

AD Nursing Program at Florence-Darlington Tec - Approved

Dr. Morris stated that the Medical University had submitted a program for the training of physician's assistants which was not received in time for evaluation and review but would be taken up at the February meeting. Dr. Peebles requested that the Commission, although not approving the program at this time, approve the concept in principle because grant requests have to be prepared and the Medical University was prepared to proceed with the grant requests. A motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Sheheen) that the concept of training physician's assistants be approved in principle and that formal consideration of the program will be taken up at the February meeting of the Commission. The motion was passed unanimously.

XII. Letter from Dr. Edwards Concerning Recommendations by Commission on Capital Improvement Requests

Dr. Morris stated that a letter had been received from Dr. Edwards concerning action taken by the Commission at the December meeting on Clemson's capital improvement requests. Dr. Edwards felt that the Commission should only recommend amounts of money available for capital improvements and leave the priority of its use to the institutions. A motion was made (Sheheen) and seconded (Smith) that the Commission respond to Dr. Edwards reaffirming its action at the December meeting on Clemson's capital improvement requests and indicate to Dr. Edwards that further study will be made of the suggestions contained in his letter of December 29.

Elizabeth T. Jumper
Elizabeth T. Jumper
Secretary