

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

November 5, 1976
10:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dr. R. Cathcart Smith, Chairman
Mr. Howard L. Burns
Mr. Arthur J. H. Clement, Jr.
Mrs. Wanda L. Forbes
Mr. Gedney M. Howe, Jr.
Mr. F. Mitchell Johnson
Mr. T. Eston Marchant
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. T. Emmet Walsh

GUESTS

Mr. G. William Dudley, Jr.
Mr. L. Roger Kirk
Dr. William H. Knisely
Adm. Joseph B. McDevitt
Mr. J. Lacy McLean
Dr. William C. Moran
Dr. Theodore S. Stern
Dr. Charles B. Vail
Dr. Robert H. White

MEMBER OF THE PRESS

Ms. Elsa Freeman

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Dr. George P. Fulton
Mr. William C. Jennings
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Mr. James R. Michael
Ms. Rosita Minerva
Mr. James L. Solomon, Jr.
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett

I. Approval of Minutes of October 12 and October 20, 1976, Commission Meetings

It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Stanback) and unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the October 12, 1976, Commission meeting as written.

Dr. Boozer stated that in the last paragraph on page 242 of the October 20 minutes, with reference to Commission approval under Separately Budgeted Research (Step 13) of \$20,074 at Francis Marion College for an "Institute for Economic Development of the Pee Dee," it should be noted that the Commission recommended that full coverage of future years' costs be obtained from the participants and other non-State sources. He suggested that a footnote to that effect be added to the original copy of the minutes. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (Quattlebaum) and unanimously voted that the minutes of the October 20, 1976, Commission meeting be approved, as corrected.

II. Consideration of Capital Improvement Requests

Mr. Michael stated that legislation enacted in 1975 regarding submission of requests for funds from Capital Improvement Bonds limits submission to alternate years, beginning in fiscal year 1976-77. Agencies are required to make such

requests to the Budget and Control Board; the Board must submit its recommendations to the General Assembly by February 15. Through arrangement with the Budget and Control Board, requests from the public colleges and universities will be submitted through the Commission on Higher Education. Mr. Michael noted that copies of all requests were previously distributed to the Commission. Dr. Boozer's memorandum of October 28 to the Commission transmitted a list of the projects (Exhibit A, Enclosure 1).

Each institution prepared and submitted in August, 1976, a forecast of capital improvements for the five-year period beginning July 1, 1977. Since requests for funding under Capital Improvement Bonds are now submitted biennially, some institutions have requested funding for projects listed for 1978-79 and beyond on the five-year forecast, as well as for 1977-78. The staff suggested that the projects listed beyond 1977-78 be forwarded to the Budget and Control Board without recommendation but with the assurance that if the Board desires to consider any of them, the Commission will expeditiously prepare and submit appropriate recommendations. After eliminating those projects previously approved by the General Assembly and/or the Commission (Tables 1, 2, and 3 of Exhibit A) and all projects forecast beyond 1977-78, 26 projects remained which required Commission action. Staff recommendations and Commission action are summarized below.

In reviewing the projects submitted by the institutions, the Commission staff noted a number which met exceptional requirements. These included the provision of minimum facilities at the emerging senior institutions; renovation of a facility at The Citadel to meet accreditation requirements; renovation of the main teaching hospital at the Medical University; and the replacement of boilers in the energy facility at South Carolina State College. All the projects recommended for approval, as well as those identified as meeting exceptional requirements, are listed in Enclosure 4 of Exhibit A.

The Citadel

Renovation of Thompson Hall - \$960,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Johnson) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Renovation of Mary Bennett Murray Hospital - \$375,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (Quattlebaum) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Clemson University

Renovation of Sirrine Hall (Phase 3) - \$1,400,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Quattlebaum) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Renovation of Cooper Library (Phase 3) - \$2,000,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (Scarborough) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted. It was noted that Clemson has now reported that this project will be financed with institutional funds. No funds from Capital Improvement Bonds are requested.

Renovation of Olin Hall - \$65,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Quattlebaum) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

College of Charleston

Educational Equipment (1. Equipment for Marine Science Center - \$306,379; 2. Equipment for Fine Arts Center - \$350,000; 3. Equipment for Education Center - \$180,000; 4. Mini-computer - \$144,833; and 5. Microscopes - \$51,000) - \$1,032,212. The staff recommended supplemental funding for the Marine Science Center in the amount of \$306,379, the Fine Arts Center for \$350,000, and the Education Center for \$180,000, from funds now frozen by the 5 percent limitation. It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Johnson) that the staff recommendations be approved. The motion was adopted.

Francis Marion College

Cafeteria Expansion - \$245,000. The staff recommended disapproval for funding under the Capital Improvement Bonds Act. Mr. Clement asked if the staff would approve the request if the project were funded from revenue from the enterprise itself. Mr. Michael stated that the recommendation might be reworded to the effect that the staff approves the project, provided the funds come from the auxiliary enterprise or from Plant Improvement Bonds, with no funding under the Capital Improvement Bonds Act. Mr. Johnson stated that no broker would issue \$245,000 in Plant Improvement Bonds because they would be too expensive. President Stern agreed, and expressed the view that because cafeterias have been funded under General Obligation Bonds in the past it would be unfair to change the policy for this particular facility. He stated that a cafeteria cannot be funded by purchasing bonds through revenue from the enterprise, as can dormitories.

It was moved (Johnson) and seconded (Marchant) that the project be approved under the Capital Improvement Bonds Act. Mr. Walsh stated that, in his opinion, dormitories and cafeterias should be self-supporting and that the Commission, therefore, should not approve the project. He stated that the Commission should be the coordinating authority only and should not recommend approval of every project requested by the institutions. He noted the trend toward decreased enrollments over the country, and stated that such factors should be taken into consideration by the Commission.

Mr. Johnson stated that the question was not whether the need existed but how the project should be funded. Mr. Clement agreed with Mr. Walsh that it is not the basic responsibility of the Commission to approve all requests. Mr. Burns stated that he could not make a responsible judgment on any of the requests at this time and suggested that a standing committee on capital improvements be appointed. Mr. Howe concurred. The motion that the project be approved under the Capital Improvement Bonds Act was adopted, with 8 voting in favor and 3 opposing.

Campus Development - \$325,000; Observatory - \$65,000; and Landscaping - \$210,000. The staff recommended disapproval of all three projects. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Scarborough) that the staff recommendations be approved. The motion was adopted.

Lander College

Renovation of Grier Center - \$255,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Scarborough) that the recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Fine Arts and Administrative Wings for College Center - \$3,400,000. The staff recommended disapproval. It was moved (Scarborough) and seconded (Walsh) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Medical University of South Carolina

Hospital Renovation - \$5,000,000. The staff recommended approval of the expanded project. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Howe) that the recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Land Acquisition - \$2,000,000. Mr. Michael noted that the Commission has approved \$1,000,000, which has not been funded, to purchase land to accommodate future expansion. No specific purchases have been identified to justify an increase. The staff recommended disapproval of the \$1,000,000 increase. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Scarborough) that the recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Continuing Education Center - \$5,000,000. The staff recommended that consideration be deferred pending development as a Charleston Consortium project. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Howe) that the recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Nursing Education Facility - \$1,165,000. The staff recommended approval provided federal funds are made available to meet two-thirds of the cost. It was moved (Pratt) and seconded (Scarborough) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

General Renovation - \$500,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Walsh) that the recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

South Carolina State College

Physical Plant Facilities Complex - \$3,000,000. Mr. Michael stated that there appears to be a requirement for the proposed complex but further information is need to fully justify the request. He noted that two boilers in the central energy plant must be replaced. In December, 1974, the Commission approved a request for \$250,000 for this purpose which has not been funded. Aside from replacing the boilers, delay in starting the project would not be critical to the College. If the institution received \$300,000 at this time it could replace the boilers and employ professional assistance in developing detailed plans for the total complex. The staff recommended approval of an additional \$50,000 to cover increased cost of the boilers and to obtain professional assistance, for a total of \$300,000. It was moved (Stanback) and seconded (Johnson) that the staff recommendations be approved. The motion was adopted.

Addition to Classroom Building - \$1,500,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Stanback) and seconded (Howe) that the recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Dormitory for Women - \$1,500,000. Mr. Michael stated that South Carolina State College has financed some residential facilities from student fees and currently carries Student-Faculty Housing Bond indebtedness of \$1,895,000. According to the institution, it requires income from all

residential facilities to finance this indebtedness. No increase is possible without increasing housing fees, which is not considered feasible in view of the large percentage of students from low-income families. It was noted that while South Carolina State has a large proportion of the student body receiving financial aid, in actual numbers there are many such students on other campuses which have not received State funds for residential facilities. The staff recommended approval with the understanding that future requests for State funds to support auxiliary enterprises will not be favorably considered. It was moved (Stanback) and seconded (Howe) that the recommendation be approved.

Mr. Clement inquired concerning whether or not a study has been made of the individual students currently receiving financial aid at South Carolina State College. He stated that when he observes the number of student-owned vehicles on the campus, he questions whether the Commission can justify the continued low student fees at S.C. State as compared with fees at other State institutions. He requested that the Commission be provided information concerning whether or not the additional income from higher fees at the new dormitory would be sufficient to finance the facility.

Mr. Johnson stated that, because the Commission cannot possibly make a determination concerning future commitments, in his view the staff recommendation was not in order. A substitute motion was made (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Clement) that the recommendation be amended to read simply, "The staff recommends approval." The motion was adopted. It was moved (Walsh) that it is the sense of the Commission that all facilities associated with auxiliary enterprises be funded out of auxiliary funds. Mr. Johnson requested that the motion be disapproved and that the Commission consider each issue independently in the future. Mr. Howe reiterated the request that a standing committee on capital improvements be appointed so that recommendations might be developed by the committee prior to Commission meetings. Mr. Walsh withdrew the motion. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Marchant) that Dr. Smith and Dr. Boozer be requested to give thought to what mechanism would best address the subject of reviewing capital improvement requests in the future, and come back with a recommendation at a later meeting. The motion was adopted.

University of South Carolina

Utility Distribution System - \$1,850,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Scarborough) and seconded (Howe) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

USC-Aiken

Campus Development - \$800,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Scarborough) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted, with Mr. Quattlebaum dissenting.

USC-Spartanburg

Hodge Center Addition - \$1,000,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Marchant) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted, with Mr. Quattlebaum dissenting.

Campus Development - \$250,000. Approval recommended. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Marchant) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted, with 7 voting in favor and 4 opposing.

Winthrop College

Barrier-free Design Modifications - \$661,250. Approval recommended. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Johnson) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Replacement of Primary Waterlines - \$143,750. Approval recommended. It was moved (Pratt) and seconded (Marchant) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Mr. Michael stated that the staff recommended that the Budget and Control Board be informed that a number of approved projects have been identified by the Commission as meeting exceptional requirements (Enclosure 4 of Exhibit A). It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Walsh) that the recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

Other Business

A. Recommendation of Council of Presidents Concerning Federally Funded Positions. Dr. Knisely, Chairman of the Council of Presidents of Public Senior Colleges and Universities, reported that efforts to utilize efficiently and effectively the support resources provided by the State are being handicapped by the freeze on hiring new personnel and on filling vacant positions. He assured the Commission that the Council of Presidents is making every effort to develop cooperative programs in education, such as the Medical University's cooperative programs in nursing with Francis Marion College and in biomedical engineering with Clemson. He expressed concern that the Budget and Control Board has recently disapproved several federally funded positions, and stated that in the view of the Council of Presidents prohibiting the institutions from using federal or private funds in filling positions is not advantageous to the State in its efforts to reduce expenditures from State funds. He requested that the Commission recommend to the Budget and Control Board, in support of the Council of Presidents, (1) that those positions funded from federal and private sources be exempted from the personnel freeze; and (2) that the Budget and Control Board make a critical analysis of the impact of the personnel freeze on State institutions of higher education, as well as its effect on other State agencies and institutions, and on what all are attempting to accomplish mutually for the good of the State. He requested that the Commission convey to the Budget and Control Board these views of the Council of Presidents. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Stanback) that the Budget and Control Board be advised that the Commission on Higher Education strongly supports the position and recommendations of the Council of Presidents. The motion was adopted.

B. Remedial Education. Mr. Clement suggested that, at a later meeting, discussion be given to the subject of remedial education in senior institutions. He noted that the following statement had appeared in the Commission's publication, Goals For Higher Education to 1980 (Vol. 1):

"Students should be admitted to the two-year institutions under criteria less stringent than those at state colleges and universities, and remedial curricula should be offered

for those students who need to improve their ability to perform satisfactorily in college-level courses. Cost to students at such institutions should be as low as possible."

Mr. Clement asked why the Commission had deviated from the policy of encouraging students who need remedial work to attend local two-year colleges, where they might live at home, rather than senior institutions at additional expense to both student and taxpayer. He requested clarification at a future meeting concerning the matter of utilizing the two-year colleges for remedial work and permitting the senior colleges to give primary attention to students who are adequately prepared for college work. Mrs. Forbes commented that she had asked that question about a year ago and had never received a satisfactory answer.

Dr. Boozer stated that while the "Goals Report" was a statement of position on the part of the Commission, some of the matters, under State law, are actually institutional decisions. He commented that the Commission itself has not moved away from the idea of encouraging students to attend two-year institutions, and that some of the senior institutions that offered remedial work at the time the "Goals Report" was written have continued to do so while others have discontinued such courses. He noted that several studies currently underway by the Commission address those kinds of matters, such as a Committee on Freshman Admissions (being appointed at this time) to be made up of institutional admissions officers with representatives of the different types of institutions in the State; and a Committee on Transfer Students, which is studying problems of articulation of two-year students who transfer to four-year colleges or vice versa, and the relationships between the institutions. It is anticipated that State policies will be developed through the guidance of such committees.

C. Christmas Reception-Buffer. In response to an inquiry from Dr. Smith concerning the Christmas reception-buffet usually held on the evening prior to the December Commission meeting, it was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Clement) that the Commission not have such a reception this year. The motion was adopted.

D. Welcome by President Stern. President Stern welcomed the Commission to the College of Charleston and invited members and guests to accompany him on a brief tour of the campus and to a luncheon in the Student Center. The Chairman expressed to President Stern and Mr. Johnson the appreciation of the Commission for the generous hospitality that had been extended.

On motion made (Walsh) and seconded (Scarborough) and unanimously voted, the meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gaylon Syrett
Gaylon Syrett
Recording Secretary