

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

June 5, 1975
11:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dr. R. Cathcart Smith, Chairman
Mr. Howard L. Burns
Mr. Hugh M. Chapman
Dr. Marianna W. Davis
Mr. Gedney M. Howe, Jr.
Mr. Larkin H. Jennings, Jr.
Mr. Paul W. McAlister
Mr. T. Eston Marchant
Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, Jr.
Mr. Fred R. Sheheen
Mr. O. Stanley Smith
Mr. I. P. Stanback

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Mr. Horace F. Byrne
Mr. Charles A. Brooks
Mr. Robert Floyd
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
Mrs. Rosita M. Ramsey
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett
Mrs. Judi R. Tillman

GUESTS

Col. J. F. Bosch, Jr.
Dr. Larry A. Jackson
Mr. L. Roger Kirk
Mr. J. Lacy McLean
Mr. Samuel P. Manning
Dr. Charles E. Palmer

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

Mr. Henry Eason
Mr. Ralph Greer
Mr. Robert Hitt
Ms. Warren McInnis
Ms. Debbie Moore
Ms. Linda Smith

I. Approval of Minutes of May 1, 1975, Commission Meeting

It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Quattlebaum) and unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the May 1, 1975, Commission meeting, as written.

II. Consideration of Academic Programs

a. University of South Carolina, Spartanburg Regional Campus - 9 Baccalaureate Degree Programs

Dr. Kinard stated that the Commission, at its May 1, 1975, meeting, voted to defer approval of nine baccalaureate degree programs at USC-Spartanburg for an additional 30 days (see minutes of May 1, 1975, CHE meeting), with final action to be taken by the Commission on June 5, 1975, in order that "contractual arrangements" which had been requested by private colleges in the Spartanburg area could be explored. He reported that the presidents and deans of the Spartanburg area institutions (the University branch, Spartanburg Technical College, and Wofford, Converse, Spartanburg Methodist, and Limestone Colleges) had met formally twice with CHE staff, on May 8 and May 22, that the deans of these institutions had also met separately on May 16 and on May 27, and that the librarians had met periodically. The objective of these meetings was to concentrate on three specific areas of cooperation of prime importance -- sharing of library resources, sharing of faculty, and cross-registration of students -- and to specify the mechanisms by which these can be accomplished. Dr. Kinard stated that because the areas of immediate concern in cooperative arrangements have now been identified in detail, and the mechanisms to provide these arrangements have been agreed to in principle, the staff recommends that the following nine baccalaureate degree programs proposed by the University for its Spartanburg branch be approved, for implementation in August, 1975: Business Administration; Biology; Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, and Physical Education; English; History; and Psychology.

It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Sheheen) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted. /Note: See also below, p. 136.]

b. Earth Sciences and Resources Institute - University of South Carolina, Columbia

The staff recommended approval. It was moved (Chapman) and seconded (Quattlebaum) and unanimously voted to adopt the staff recommendation.

c. Recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Graduate Teacher Education Regarding Use by In-State Colleges of ETV Course, "Teacher as Manager"

Dr. Kinard reported that in 1973-74 the Commission's Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Off-Campus Teacher Education was responsible for the development of a video-taped course, to be used in graduate teacher education programs, entitled "Teacher as Manager." The production was carried out, under the direction of a sub-committee of the Ad Hoc

Advisory Committee, by SCETV. The course consists of a series of 26 thirty-minute segments broadcast over the ETV open-circuit system at intervals throughout an academic term. Student handbooks for each registrant are also provided. The cost of this project was underwritten by the Commission on Higher Education, six public institutions (U.S.C., Clemson, The Citadel, Winthrop, S.C. State College, and the College of Charleston), and SCETV. Each of the colleges and universities contributed \$6,000 toward the costs, which totaled about \$100,000. Five of the six institutions which participated in the development of the course offered it for credit during the 1974-75 academic year, with a total of 700 students registered.

At its meeting on April 25, 1975, the Advisory Committee on Graduate Teacher Education, successor to the Ad Hoc Committee, considered an inquiry from a non-public college within the State as to whether or not it might be allowed to use the course, when broadcast, in its own program of teacher training. Unauthorized use of such broadcast materials may subject the user to legal action by the Federal Communications Commission. The Committee recommended to the CHE that colleges or universities within the State of South Carolina, other than those which helped underwrite the development of the ETV course, "Teacher as Manager," be offered the use of the course broadcast in the open circuit mode for the use of their students in a formal course of instruction, subject to the provision that a one-time utilization fee of \$1,000 for such authorization be paid by the college or university to the Commission on Higher Education, and subject to the provision that the Commission would deposit such fees in the permanent fund established by it for this purpose.

Dr. Kinard stated that the effect of this recommendation is to make the course available to a larger number of South Carolina teachers. The Committee believed that the payment of a one-time fee for such authorized use by any college and university in its instructional program is necessary for legal purposes, and is desirable in maintaining a fund which can be used for further cooperative ventures of this kind. A token fee would suffice for the first purpose but not for the second. The staff recommended that the Committee's recommendation be approved, with the required fee reduced to \$500.

Dr. Kinard noted that the ETV System is continuing negotiations which may lead to a further recommendation to the Commission regarding use by out-of-state institutions or systems of the video tapes comprising this course. Some interest in marketing this course nationally (except in South Carolina) has been expressed by the Great Plains National Instructional Television Library, an agency of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

Mr. Quattlebaum suggested that, if both public and private institutions will offer the course, the fee be further reduced to \$100. It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Stanback) that the staff recommendation be approved, except that the required fee be reduced to \$100.

Mr. Sheheen suggested charging a token fee of \$1.00 plus the cost of materials. He stated his objection to maintaining a discretionary fund such as the one referred to in the proposal, indicating his belief that discretionary funds can be abused.

Dr. Kinard stated that the fund referred to is an authorized permanent fund, already established for the purpose of holding proceeds from the sale of student handbooks, to be used for reprinting costs of the books. Mr. Sheheen suggested that such funds revert to the Budget and Control Board at the end of each fiscal year. Mr. Howe concurred in this suggestion.

After further discussion, the motion was amended (Sheheen) and seconded (Quattlebaum) to approve the staff recommendation, except that the fee be reduced to \$1.00. The amended motion was adopted.

III. Capital Improvement Request -- Clemson University

Mr. Michael reported that Clemson University had submitted a request to construct a new facility to house the functions of the Purchasing Division which is now dispersed over the campus. The estimated gross square footage of the facility is 31,200, and the estimated cost is \$646,000, to be provided from institutional bonds. The staff recommended approval. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (McAlister) and unanimously voted to adopt the staff recommendation.

IV. Report of Federal Programs Committee - Annual Amendment to State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education (Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965)

Mr. Howe reported that the Committee on Federal Programs reviewed the Fiscal Year 1976 Annual Amendment to the South Carolina State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education (Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965), which was prepared in accordance with directions received from the U.S. Office of Education. He noted that the State Plan provides the basis for the selection of proposals to be funded under Title I in South Carolina in fiscal year 1976. Upon approval by the Commission, the document will be forwarded to Governor Edwards for signature and then to the U.S. Office of Education for approval.

Mr. Howe stated that the Plan calls for emphasis to be given in funding Title I projects in fiscal year 1976 to the problem areas of government, environmental education, and human services and health. He noted that, in addition, a Special Demonstration Project will be initiated by the Commission on Higher Education with the assistance of colleges and universities in the State. This three-year research, action, and evaluation project will be directed toward the development of a comprehensive and coordinated Statewide plan for continuing education. The Committee on Federal Programs suggested that the staff address itself to continuing

education as it relates to the private sector as well as to the public sector, and recommended approval of the State Plan as developed by the staff. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (Marchant) that the Commission approve the Annual Amendment to the South Carolina State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education (Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965).

At Mr. Sheheen's request, Mr. Powers commented concerning the Special Demonstration Project, stating that while the Commission will provide the leadership, the project will be developed by an institution, acting as a consultant to the Commission on Higher Education, assessing various needs in continuing education, directed primarily toward the areas of government and personal development.

In response to Mr. Sheheen's inquiry regarding the contracting institution, Dr. Boozer stated that the project might be implemented by a group of institutions, with the effort divided into subparts. He noted that the project has special relevance to the planning studies now being developed by the 1202 Commission.

Mr. Burns suggested that reference to illustrative projects or issues be eliminated from the text of the State Plan. The motion was amended (Burns) and seconded (Davis) that the Annual Amendment to the South Carolina State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education (Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965) be approved, subject to deletion of specific references as suggested above. The amended motion was adopted.

V. Report on Study of Two-year Institutions in Sumter

Mr. Michael reported that the Commission on Higher Education, in September, 1974, approved a motion which stated:

" . . . the Commission on Higher Education believes it is highly desirable that two-year public institutions in South Carolina cooperate when in the same locality and that merger should be considered when in the judgment of this Commission it is feasible and desirable. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Commission on Higher Education approve the operation of the Sumter Center by the University of South Carolina until June, 1975; that the staffs of the Commission on Higher Education, the University of South Carolina and the USC Sumter Branch, and the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education and the Sumter Area Technical College, develop plans to assure cooperation between the USC Sumter Branch and the Sumter Area Technical College while minimizing duplication; that a review of cooperative efforts be made in June, 1975, at which time the matter will again be considered by the Commission on Higher Education; and that in the interim period, the legal position of the Commission be preserved."

Mr. Michael stated that in December, 1974, the Commission approved an A.A.S. Degree program in Business at Sumter Area Technical College "... with the stipulation that the Commission on Higher Education will not approve further programs at the Sumter Area Technical College or the University of South Carolina Branch at Sumter until the requirements of the September 5, 1974, resolution on cooperative arrangements have been satisfactorily implemented in the judgment of the Commission."

Since that time, a committee of staff members of the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, the University of South Carolina, the Sumter Area Technical College, the University of South Carolina at Sumter, and the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education has met several times and has attempted to strengthen the cooperation between the two-year public institutions in Sumter. As reflected in the May 6, 1975, minutes of the Committee, considerable progress has been made in a number of areas. In addition, an out-of-state library consultant will visit the Sumter institutions on June 12 to help determine the feasibility of merging or otherwise strengthening the two libraries. It was also agreed that the two institutions should maintain a standing joint committee on academic affairs which will do a more thorough study of cross-registration in courses of both institutions and in the development or use of joint courses. Another study committee is being formed to give further study to problems of transfer of credit.

As a result of the cooperative progress being made, the staff recommended that the Commission approve the operation of the Sumter Center by the University of South Carolina and that the Sumter Regional Campus be authorized to award college parallel A.A. and A.S. Degrees upon completion by students of appropriate two-year programs. It was further recommended that the chief administrators of the Sumter Area Technical College and USC-Sumter be requested to submit jointly a semi-annual report describing progress which has been made in further implementing cooperative efforts in all areas, with special emphasis on developments which eliminate unnecessary course duplication and on progress toward elimination of a dual library system. This report should be submitted initially on October 15, 1975, and every six months thereafter until such time as the Commission requests that it be discontinued.

It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Quattlebaum) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted. Mr. Quattlebaum suggested that similar progress reports be required concerning cooperation between the institutions in Spartanburg (see May 1, 1975, minutes of the Commission). It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (S. Smith) that the Commission staff develop reports on the progress of cooperation between the institutions in Spartanburg, to be submitted to the Commission every six months. The motion was adopted. [Note: See also above, p. 132.]

VI. Report of Budget and Finance Committee and Ad Hoc Committee - Recommended Appropriation Formula for 1976-77

Mr. Chapman, Chairman of the Budget and Finance Committee, presented the report of the Budget and Finance Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee concerning the Appropriation Formula for use by the public senior colleges and universities (other than the Medical University) in making 1976-77 appropriation requests to the Commission. The report (Exhibit A), jointly prepared by the two Committees, was mailed to Commission members on May 16. Mr. Chapman expressed appreciation to the Ad Hoc Committee for its counsel and assistance, and complimented the members of the General Assembly for their dedication and commitment to education. He noted that in 1963-64 South Carolina spent 6.2% of its tax money for higher education, ranking 14th in the Southeast; in 1973-74 the State spent 17.4% of its tax revenue on higher education, ranking first in the Southeast.

After requesting permission to take the floor, Mr. Quattlebaum stated that the May 16 memorandum reported that the members of the two Committees unanimously recommended the draft of the 1976-77 Appropriation Formula for adoption by the Commission. He stated that at the meeting of the Committees on May 1, questions concerning the change in the number of credit hours for determining FTE doctoral students were not satisfactorily answered. He indicated that when he agreed to the recommendation of the Committees, he did not have the full knowledge of the effect such a change would have on the budgets of the universities.

Mr. Sheheen stated that the Committee meeting on May 1 was adjourned in order for the staff to develop additional material which the Committees felt they needed in terms of interpreting the proposed changes, and that the staff had subsequently provided all the information requested by the Committees. Mr. Quattlebaum stated his understanding that the information would be sent to the presidents of the institutions for their review, and would be discussed further at the June 5 CHE meeting, rather than being presented as the unanimous recommendation of the Committees. Mr. Sheheen stated that it was his understanding that when the Committees voted on the proposed changes, it was a vote of approval for recommendation to the Commission, and that he was satisfied that all the information which the Committees requested was provided by the staff.

It was moved (Sheheen) and seconded (S. Smith) that, as a method of procedure, Mr. Chapman be permitted to present the Committees' rationale, and that the Commission examine and vote on each Step of the Formula individually. Mr. Chapman stated that the members should have an opportunity to be heard before the Steps are voted on. Mr. S. Smith suggested that the Commission discuss each Step, but reserve acting on them until all the Steps have been discussed. Mr. Sheheen withdrew the motion. Chairman Smith stated that he would allow the institutional representative of each institution to make a statement before each Step is voted on.

Mr. McAlister stated that he is opposed to the Formula as it has been used in the past and as it is proposed for 1976-77, because it is a method of funding by use of arbitrary numbers rather than actual costs. He expressed the view that the present Formula can be mathematically manipulated, and that eight of the seventeen members of the Commission have diverse conflicts of interest. He commented that the only way to obtain realistic facts is to ascertain the actual costs of programs. He indicated that the proposed formula will decrease the equitable amount of appropriations by more than ten percent.

Mr. Burns stated that (1) when the facts and principles on which the components of the Formula are based are considered, the Formula appears to be reasonable; (2) as the Committees made their recommendations, the facts concerning each institution were examined, as were the facts concerning the other Southeastern states and the Southeast as a whole; (3) the total amount of money is the real concern of the institutions, and the Formula is usually judged on the basis of total amounts of money rather than on facts and principles; (4) the arbitrary numbers referred to by Mr. McAlister were arrived at from a number of sources, and they relate to costs; (5) the Formula is as valuable as it is honest; (6) the legislation or regulations should be modified to allow institutions to use additional income earned from increased student fees; and (7) the Commission's function, with reference to the Formula, is to ensure that the Formula provides equitable funding between and among the institutions, and to examine areas of the Formula which need to be revised, based on facts.

Mr. Marchant stated that the recommendation made by the Committees with reference to utilities is inadequate, and suggested that the Commission reconsider this recommendation. He urged the Commission to increase the universities' general research supplement in Step 13 from \$150 per FTE graduate student, which has been in effect for several years, to a more realistic figure.

Step 1: It was moved (Sheheen) and seconded (S. Smith) that the Commission approve Step 1 as recommended by the two Committees. The motion was adopted.

Step 2: Mr. Chapman noted that the Committees recommended the Formula and the CHE Report divisor for determining FTE doctoral students be changed from 6 to 9 credit hours, relating the South Carolina policy more directly to actual practice as well as making it more comparable to the policies followed by other states.

Mr. Marchant stated that South Carolina is far behind in the Southeast in graduate-level programs, and the reduction in funding which would result from this change would set the State farther back. He urged the Commission to reconsider the change. It was moved (Davis) and seconded (Sheheen) to approve the recommendation of the Committees. The motion was adopted, with Mr. Marchant and Mr. McAlister dissenting.

Step 3: It was moved (Sheheen) and seconded (S. Smith) to approve Step 3 as recommended. The motion was amended (Marchant) and seconded (McAlister) that the 1975-76 student/faculty ratios be used rather than the proposed ratios for 1976-77. The amended motion was disapproved, with four voting in favor, six opposing, and one abstaining. The motion to approve Step 3 as recommended by the Committees was adopted, with nine voting in favor and three opposing.

Step 4(a): It was moved (S. Smith) and seconded (Sheheen) and unanimously voted to approve Step 4(a) as recommended.

(b): Mr. Chapman noted that the Committees recommended that teaching faculty salaries for the four-year colleges be based on actual salaries at Winthrop, thereby recognizing the highest average salary of all colleges having the normal faculty rank structure from instructor through full professor. The Citadel's average faculty salary is not representative because faculty below the rank of assistant professor are not employed. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (Quattlebaum) to use The Citadel's average salary rather than the recommended amount. Mr. Jennings noted that this average salary would be used also for new four-year colleges. Mr. Howe withdrew the motion. It was moved (Sheheen) and seconded (S. Smith) and unanimously voted to adopt Step 4(b) as recommended by the Committees.

(c): It was moved (S. Smith) and seconded (Quattlebaum) to approve Step 4(c) as recommended. The motion was adopted.

Step 5: It was moved (Chapman) and seconded (Sheheen) and unanimously voted to adopt Step 5 as recommended. Mr. Quattlebaum suggested that the staff make an effort to get the actual instructional costs other than teaching salaries ("teaching faculty support"). Mr. Sheheen suggested that the staff obtain comparative data regarding total instructional costs from other states also.

Step 6: It was moved (Chapman) and seconded (S. Smith) and unanimously voted to adopt Step 6 as recommended.

Step 7(a): Mr. Chapman noted that under Step 7 (now proposed as Step 7(a)) the Committees recommended reducing annual increases for plant operation and maintenance (excluding utilities) back to 8% from the 10% which was allowed in 1975-76 due to higher utility costs. In addition, the maximum allowance of 36%, which was in effect prior to 1975-76, should be reduced to 31% for 1976-77 because utilities constitute approximately 15% of total plant operation and maintenance expenditures. The Committees agreed that utilities would be better provided for by establishing a new Step 7(b) based on actual 1974-75 costs of fuel oil, electricity, coal, and gas used for heating, cooling, and lighting. No maximum was suggested by the Committees. It was moved (Chapman) and seconded (S. Smith) and unanimously voted to adopt Step 7(a) as recommended.

(b): It was moved (Chapman) and seconded (S. Smith) to approve Step 7(b) as recommended. Mr. Marchant suggested that utilities be computed at the budgeted unit consumption for the prior year, plus a rated consumption for new space, times the current unit price, plus 15% subject to actual adjustment for the next year. After discussion, the motion was amended (Marchant) and seconded (Quattlebaum) to raise the annual allowance for increases in utility costs to 15%. The amended motion was approved.

Step 8: It was moved (Chapman) and seconded (Sheheen) and unanimously voted to approve Step 8 as recommended.

Step 9: It was moved (Howe) and seconded (S. Smith) and unanimously voted to approve Step 9 as recommended.

Step 10: Mr. Jennings stated that in the past, with reference to student fees, if an institution received additional income from another source or raised student fees, automatically the money that institution was entitled to receive from the State was reduced by the same amount. Institutions which have high student fees would like to get the credit for the difference, while those with low student fees do not want to be penalized for having lower than the average. Mr. Chapman stated that there are differences in the socio-economic status of students among the various institutions. Mr. Burns suggested that the Commission approve Step 10 as recommended, with further study by the staff and the Committees. It was moved (Sheheen) and seconded (Burns) that Step 10 be tentatively approved as recommended, and that the matter be referred to the Council of Presidents of the Public Colleges and Universities for its recommendation to the Commission. The motion was amended (Chapman) and seconded (S. Smith) to provide for possible revision at the September, 1975, CHE meeting. The amended motion was adopted.

Step 11: It was moved (S. Smith) and seconded (Sheheen) and unanimously voted to approve Step 11 as recommended.

Step 12(a): It was moved (Chapman) and seconded (Howe) to approve Step 12(a) as recommended. Mr. Sheheen suggested that the restriction "as required by the State" be omitted from Step 12(a). The motion was amended (Howe) and seconded (Sheheen) to add the words "or those," making the phrase read, "or those required by the State." The amended motion was adopted.

(b): Mr. Sheheen requested clarification as to whether movable equipment for new buildings is included in bond issues. Mr. Chapman stated that the Budget and Control Board has ruled that such equipment is included. Mr. Sheheen requested that a letter be sent to Mr. Johnson stating that the Commission has been so advised. Dr. Boozer suggested, and it was agreed, that a letter be written to the college and university presidents from the CHE staff, with copies to the Budget and Control Board and Commission members, stating that the Commission has been

advised by the Budget and Control Board that equipment for new buildings is included in each permanent improvement project approved by that Board, making it clear that such requests should not be included by the institutions in their Formula presentations.

It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (S. Smith) to approve Step 12(b) as recommended. The motion was adopted.

Step 13: Mr. Marchant stated that the recommended research supplement of \$150 per FTE student is not realistic, and requested that it be increased to \$300 per FTE student. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (McAlister) that the research supplement be increased from \$150 to \$300 per FTE student. Dr. Davis stated that the majority in graduate schools are engaged in research that would not require \$300. She expressed the view that the supplement should be based on the kinds of research being done and the types of programs involved. She suggested an amount closer to \$150.

The motion was amended (Howe) and seconded (Quattlebaum) that the research supplement be increased from \$150 to \$250. A substitute motion was made (Sheheen) and seconded (Davis) that the research supplement be increased to \$200. The substitute motion was disapproved. The amended motion to increase the supplement to \$250 was adopted, with five voting in favor and three opposing.

Mr. McAlister requested that the record show that his votes in favor of any of the Steps do not contravene his over-all position on the Formula. The 1976-77 Appropriation Formula, as approved, is attached as Exhibit B.

VII. Other Business

Dr. Smith reported that Mr. Lucas Padgett of the South Carolina Public Service Authority has invited the Commission to use the Authority's facilities at Wampee Plantation for a weekend meeting, preferably in the fall. The cost would be \$25.00 per day for each person, for room, board, and other expenses.

Dr. Boozer introduced Mr. Robert Floyd, who works part-time on the Commission staff as a student intern. The intern program, administered by the Governor's Office, was discussed at the June 6, 1974, meeting of the Commission (see minutes of the June 6, 1974, CHE meeting). Dr. Boozer reported that three other students are employed as interns on the Commission staff -- one in the facilities area, one in the library, and one who will assist the statisticians in developing enrollment projections during the summer.

Dr. Boozer suggested that, since the first Thursday in July falls on July 3, the Commission meeting be deferred to July 10. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (Burns) and unanimously voted to schedule the next meeting of the Commission on July 10, 1975.

After requesting permission to take the floor, Dr. Davis stated that the Commission should address itself to issues in higher education other than just academic program approval and review of institutional appropriations. She expressed the view that the Commission should provide leadership in all concerns of higher education in South Carolina, specifically in matters of interest to both the State and Federal government, such as the Affirmative Action program. She noted that the Affirmative Action guidelines provided by HEW show comparative data for the Southeastern states on such matters as programs funded by state or federal appropriations which use women in administrative positions, and those which concern ethnic minorities. She suggested that the Commission staff obtain and have available information regarding such matters, and possibly develop studies to assist in future planning. She stated that the Commission also should address itself to students and student concerns.

Dr. Smith suggested that Dr. Davis present these ideas to the Commission at its July meeting in a formal statement. He stated that there are indications that the U.S. Office of Education will request this type of information from South Carolina in the near future, and noted that the M.I.S. system will aid the staff in gathering data so that such questions can be answered quickly and accurately.

Dr. Boozer stated that matters such as those mentioned by Dr. Davis are appropriate concerns to the Commission and will be included in the planning process as the staff proceeds with the various studies of the 1202 Commission.

It was moved (Sheheen) and seconded (Marchant) and unanimously voted that the Commission present a citation of appreciation to Mr. S. Smith whose term on the Commission expires on July 1, 1975. It was noted that the Governor has requested that members continue to serve beyond the expiration dates of their terms, until new appointments have been made.

At 4:00 p.m., it was moved (Stanback) and seconded (Scarborough) and unanimously voted that the meeting be adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Gaylon Syrett
Gaylon Syrett
Recording Secretary