

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

December 7, 1978
10:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Arthur M. Swanson, Chairman
Dr. James E. Bostic, Jr.
Mr. Arthur J. H. Clement, Jr.
Dr. B. J. Cooper
Mrs. Jennie C. Dreher
Mr. Robert C. Gallagher
Mr. Roosevelt Gilliam, Jr.
Mr. Robert E. Graham
Gen. Hugh P. Harris
Mr. Joseph O. Rogers, Jr.
Mr. J. Clyde Shirley
Mr. C. Otis Taylor, Jr.
Mrs. Margaret E. Wells
Mr. Robert P. Wilkins
Dr. Robert F. Williams
Dr. Louis D. Wright, Jr.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS

Mr. Hugh Gibson

GUESTS

Dr. Francis T. Borkowski
Mr. Joseph B. Davenport
Dr. Alexander G. Donald
Mrs. Ruby M. Fricks
Dr. Larry A. Jackson
Mr. James F. Keasler
Dr. William H. Knisely
Dr. Benjamin F. Lawson
Mr. Andrew P. Leventis, Jr.
Mr. J. Lacy McLean
Dr. James R. Morris, Jr.
Dr. M. Maceo Nance, Jr.
Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum
Dr. Olin Sansbury
Dr. Charles B. Vail
Mr. John E. Wise

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Mr. Charles A. Brooks, Jr.
Mrs. Clara W. Evans
Dr. George P. Fulton
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Mr. Alan S. Krech
Mr. Cannon R. Mayes
Mr. James R. Michael
Mrs. Ann Shelton
Mr. James L. Solomon, Jr.
Mr. Joseph A. Syiek
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett
Mrs. Judi R. Tillman

I. Approval of Minutes of November 9, 1978, Commission Meeting

Mr. Clement expressed opposition to the suggestion made at the November 9 meeting that Commission letterhead include the names of Commission members, and requested that no action be taken in response to this suggestion without further discussion. He requested further that the record show that he abstained from voting, except where otherwise indicated, on the recommendations of the Facilities Committee concerning capital improvements (see minutes of the November 9, 1978, Commission meeting, pp. 382-88).

It was moved (Shirley) and seconded (Gallagher) that the minutes of the November 9, 1978, Commission meeting, amended as requested by Mr. Clement, be approved. The motion was adopted.

II. Report of Academic Programs Committee

B.S. Degree in Extra-corporeal Circulation Technology - MUSC

Mr. Clement, chairman of the Academic Programs Committee, reported that the Committee recommended approval of the program. He stated that he opposed Committee approval because he is not convinced that a pressing local need exists or that the program must be implemented before the master plan is available. Dr. Williams stated that the present two-year program will terminate in July and that, therefore, there is a pressing local need for the baccalaureate program to be implemented.

It was moved (Williams) and seconded (Shirley) that the recommendation of the Committee be approved. The motion was adopted, with Mr. Clement opposing.

III. Report of the Facilities Committee

Mr. Taylor, chairman of the Facilities Committee, reported that the Committee made the following recommendations on nine capital improvement projects, three of which were on the agenda of the November 9 Commission meeting. He noted that the recommendations regarding Winthrop and Lander were based in part on visits by the Committee to the two campuses on November 15 and 21, respectively.

Winthrop College

1. Athletic Facility - \$5,000,000. On November 9 the Committee recommended that this project be approved. After discussion, the Commission approved a motion that the institution be requested to prepare a proposal for a gymnasium that will be adequate for its needs now and for a reasonable time in the future. Further, it was agreed that the Committee would reexamine the need for this project during its visit to Winthrop on November 15. He stated that the Committee verified the inadequacy of the existing gymnasium, which was constructed in 1915, and agreed that a delay of one year would increase the cost of the project by 10 to 15 percent. The site for the proposed facility is now a field; an entrance road, parking space, and sidewalks are essential. The Committee reaffirmed the pressing need for the facility and recommended that it be approved.

It was moved (Taylor) and seconded (Dreher) that the recommendations of the Committee be approved. The motion was adopted, with 11 voting in favor and Dr. Bostic, Mr. Clement, Mr. Rogers, and Mr. Wilkins opposing. Mr. Wilkins requested that the record show he opposed the Committee's recommendation because, in his opinion, the project does not meet pressing local need criteria. Mr. Rogers requested that the following statement be included in the minutes: "I voted 'No' on the request of Winthrop for an athletic facility of \$5,000,000 for the following reasons: (a) At the November 9, 1978, meeting of this Commission we asked Winthrop to come back with a limited plan. They have not responded to that request; (b) We were told that the Budget and Control Board had the architect's selection on its agenda for next week. Under that view I see no logical basis for the Commission's action."

President Vail noted that the five-year forecast submitted by Winthrop a year ago included the facility, and that the 1978-79 Appropriation Act included \$150,000 in planning funds for the facility. Dr. Bostic asked if the Commission previously approved planning funds for the project. Mr. Michael stated that

the project has not been before the Commission previously. He noted that for a number of years the colleges and universities have submitted five-year forecasts to the Commission. These forecasts have not required action or approval by the Commission but simply served as planning documents. Certain projects have been extracted from the forecasts by the institutions and presented to the Commission for its approval. In some instances, notwithstanding the Commission's recommendations, the General Assembly has acted on its own, as in the case of the proposed athletic facility at Winthrop. The General Assembly has indicated its approval by first authorizing Winthrop to sell a tract of land and retain the proceeds from the sale to finance part of the project, and by appropriating \$150,000 in planning funds for the facility.

Mr. Rogers stated that in his opinion, because the Legislature has appropriated planning funds prior to consideration by the Commission, the Commission should take no action on the matter. He suggested that in the future the Commission be made aware of projects previously approved by the General Assembly and that such projects not be considered by the Commission. Mr. Swanson stated that the Commission is required to make recommendations on all capital improvement projects. Mr. Clement stated that if an institution is able to appeal directly to the Budget and Control Board for funds, discussion by the Commission is an exercise in futility. Mrs. Dreher stated that it is the Commission's responsibility to take action on every capital improvement project submitted.

2. Small Animal Building - \$25,000 from Institutional Bonds. Mr. Taylor stated that on November 9 this project was considered in a group of four, entitled Miscellany, at a total cost of \$215,000 to be funded through Capital Improvement Bonds. The Committee recommended that all four be deferred and the Commission agreed. President Vail subsequently requested that the Small Animal Facility be reconsidered, to meet a pressing local need. The facility is now located in the basement of Bancroft Hall, a dormitory that is scheduled to be converted back to use as student housing. The Committee recommended that the Commission reconsider its November 9 action with respect to this project and that it be approved.

It was moved (Taylor) and seconded (Graham) that the recommendation of the Committee be approved. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Lander College

Planning for Fine Arts Wing - \$270,000 (estimated total cost - \$4,500,000). On November 9 the Committee recommended that this project be approved, but the Commission adopted a motion that it be deferred. Mr. Taylor stated that the Committee's visit to Lander on November 21 confirmed its recommendation that the project be approved. The proposed facility is planned to serve the disciplines of art, music, and drama for Lander and to serve the larger community of the Upper Savannah Region as a "regional arts center." It is the fourth of five major facilities which must be constructed to provide a minimum acceptable physical plant. The academic and cultural programs to be housed in the building are currently in the original Lander College building which was constructed in 1904 and is scheduled for demolition as soon as adequate facilities can be provided. There is a pressing need to construct the facility, not only to provide a minimum physical plant for Lander but to vacate an old building which does not meet minimum standards for the handicapped and possibly in areas of health and safety. The Committee recommended that the Commission reconsider its November 9 action with respect to this project.

It was moved (Taylor) and seconded (Harris) that the recommendation of the Committee be approved. Mr. Gallager stated that the future role of Lander, in the over-all context of the master plan, has not been determined. The motion was amended (Wright) to provide that Lander make an effort to seek financial support outside traditional funding sources for the ultimate construction of the facility.

Mr. Wilkins suggested that the Commission ask the Attorney General to interpret the following statement from Act 410 (1978) to assist the Commission in determining its own legal obligation and in understanding whether programs should be considered initially by the Budget and Control Board or by the Commission: "While the Commission is conducting its study and until such time as the master plan is adopted, no public institution of higher learning shall expand its curricula, administrative staff or faculty nor shall there be further construction of physical plants other than construction already approved by the General Assembly or State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education unless such expansion or construction is approved by the commission and the Budget and Control Board or either body of the General Assembly to satisfy pressing local needs."

Mr. Shirley stated that the General Assembly left it to the Commission's discretion and judgment to interpret the Act. After further discussion, Mr. Wilkins suggested that Dr. Boozer write to the Budget and Control Board and request its interpretation of the statute.

Dr. Wright withdrew the amendment to the motion. The motion that the recommendations of the Committee be approved was adopted, with eight voting in favor. Dr. Bostic, Mr. Gallager, Mr. Gilliam, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Shirley, and Mr. Wilkins opposed, and Mr. Clement abstained. Mr. Wilkins requested that the minutes show that he opposed because in his opinion the proposed facility would not meet the pressing local needs criteria.

USC-Spartanburg

Construction of a School of Nursing Facility - \$2,000,000 from Federal, local, and foundation sources. In Fall, 1975, the Commission approved a baccalaureate program in nursing at USC-Spartanburg. Shortly thereafter the institution began the development of plans for a School of Nursing building to be financed with Federal, local, and foundation funds. In August, 1978, USC submitted an application for Federal funds to the Budget and Control Board for approval, in accordance with State law. On October 31 the Budget and Control Board returned the application to USC with the following comment: "The Budget and Control Board is returning the attached project without action until the Commission on Higher Education recommends approval of this construction project (reference Act 410 of 1978)." The nursing program is currently housed in a part of the student center, and a new building is needed to provide the kind of facilities required for a baccalaureate program. The Committee recommended that the project be approved.

It was moved (Taylor) and seconded (Harris) that the recommendation of the Committee be approved. Mr. Wilkins requested, and it was agreed, that the motion include the proviso that no State funds shall be required for construction. The motion was adopted, with 12 voting in favor, Mr. Gallager opposing, and Mr. Clement abstaining.

Medical University of South Carolina

1. Sumnerall Center Lease - Hold Improvements - \$275,000. The Committee recommended that the project be approved. It was moved (Taylor) and seconded (Graham) that the recommendation of the Committee be approved. The motion was adopted.

2. Computer Electrical Equipment - \$400,000. The Committee recommended that the project be approved. It was moved (Taylor) and seconded (Graham) that the recommendation of the Committee be approved. The motion was adopted.

3. Demolition of "A" Building - \$50,000. The Committee recommended that the project be approved. It was moved (Taylor) and seconded (Harris) that the recommendation of the Committee be approved. The motion was adopted.

4. Hospital Admitting and Minor Treatment Room - \$200,000. The Committee recommended that the project be approved. It was moved (Taylor) and seconded (Harris) that the recommendation of the Committee be approved. The motion was adopted.

5. BCD Building - \$2,000,000. This facility was designed for medical and dental offices, and includes a five-story office building, a one-story retail pharmacy building, and surrounding land and paved parking areas. Two appraisals place the "replacement cost" at \$1,974,310 and \$1,946,000; the lower figure has been accepted as the sale price. It should be noted that one appraisal places the "fair market value" of the property at \$1,376,350. An offer of this amount by MUSC was rejected. The Medical University's justification for this facility includes immediate need for the 280 parking spaces included with the property, immediate need for approximately 15,000 square feet for two academic programs, and a long-term need to establish an academic facility for clinical training of primary care physicians. The Committee recommended that the project be deferred until the master plan is available. It was moved (Taylor) and seconded (Bostic) that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

Mr. Gallagher requested that the minutes show that because he represents professionally some of the owners of the BCD Building he abstained from both the discussion and from voting. Mr. Wilkins stated that in his opinion a pressing local need exists and MUSC should be authorized to take advantage of the opportunity to purchase the property. A substitute motion was made (Wilkins) and seconded (Graham) that the project be approved as meeting a pressing local need, subject to determination by the appropriate State officials as to whether the price is a fair price. After discussion, a second substitute motion was made (Wilkins) and seconded (Clement) that the project be approved as meeting a pressing local need, but that the Commission express no opinion as to the correctness of a fair market value of the contract due to lack of sufficient information.

Mr. Clement stated that in his opinion it would be advisable for MUSC to purchase the building now because the value would appreciate in the period of a year. The motion to approve the recommendation of the Committee was disapproved, with five affirmative and eight negative votes. Mr. Gallagher abstained. The second substitute motion, that the project be approved, was adopted, with 12 affirmative and one negative votes. Mr. Gallagher abstained.

USC-Union Campus

Central School Renovation - \$150,000 (plus \$400,000 from State Institution Bonds). On November 9 the Facilities Committee recommended approval of the project, but the Commission voted to defer consideration until the master plan is available. Mr. Graham stated that following the Committee's visit to Lander on November 21 he drove to Union to visit the two-year branch campus there. Based in part on the campus visit, the Committee reaffirmed the pressing need for the project and recommended that it be approved. It was moved (Graham) and seconded (Gilliam) that the Commission reconsider the request from USC-Union and that the project be approved. Mr. Clement requested that the matter be referred back to the Facilities Committee and that the Committee make a recommendation to the full Commission at its January meeting. Mr. Rogers suggested, and Mr. Gallagher concurred, that the Committee review the requests from all four of the branch campuses (Beaufort, Salkehatchie, Sumter, and Union). Mr. Swanson stated that it would be up to the Committee to make that determination. Dr. Bostic stated that if the Commission reconsiders each project on the basis of a visit to the campus by the Committee, the entire review procedure could be repeated.

The motion that the project be approved was adopted, with eight affirmative and seven negative votes. Dr. Bostic, Mr. Clement, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Shirley, Mr. Wilkins, and Dr. Wright opposed. Mr. Clement requested that the record show that he opposed because of the method of handling.

President Nance stated that when he was contacted by Mr. Michael concerning the possibility of a visit to the campus of South Carolina State College by the Facilities Committee on November 7, he indicated that classes would not be in session that day because it was a legal holiday but that he would be available if the Committee chose to visit. The Committee decided to postpone the visit. Dr. Nance stated that he is scheduled to appear before the Budget and Control Board on December 12 at which time he will report that South Carolina State College's capital improvement requests were not considered by the Commission to meet pressing local need requirements, and that because of time constraints the Committee was not able to visit the campus.

Dr. Wright suggested that it be noted that the Facilities Committee did not make recommendations on requests from South Carolina State College because it did not have the opportunity to visit the campus prior to the Commission meeting. Mr. Clement stated that he opposes Commission support of an individual appeal by a president to the Budget and Control Board.

IV. Consideration of Proposed Standing Committee on Health and Medical Education

Dr. Boozer stated that it was suggested at the Commission meeting on November 9 that the Commission consider establishing a Standing Committee in the health area. The staff proposed that that suggestion be implemented by the creation of a Standing Committee on Health and Medical Education. The formation of such a Standing Committee would give official recognition and provide a mechanism for the Commission to respond to the substantial percentage of educational funds expended for health and medical education, the increasing importance of this segment of higher education in terms of the national need for improved health care at cost effective levels, and the necessity for coordination of the two medical schools in South Carolina. The Commission has a precedent

for such a Committee which functioned during the period when the proposal for a new medical school was under study.

The Health Education Authority, created in 1974 as an advisory committee on health affairs to the Commission, has generated a cooperative and coordinative approach to the review of health and medically related programs and to planning. This contribution has been visible largely through the advice and counsel provided to the Commission through the Assistant Director for Health Affairs who has been chairman of the Health Education Authority since its inception. Dr. Boozer recommended that a member of the proposed Standing Committee on Health and Medical Education become the chairman of the Health Education Authority, and that the other members of the Committee become ex officio members of HEA to provide a better bridge between the Commission and HEA and to assist the Commission in its decision-making, regulatory, and policy-making roles.

It was moved (Wilkins) and seconded (Bostic) that a Standing Committee on Health and Medical Education be approved. The motion was adopted unanimously. Mr. Swanson appointed Dr. Cooper, Mr. Gallager, Mr. Gilliam, Dr. Williams, and Dr. Wright to serve on the Committee. At Mr. Swanson's request, the Committee met briefly for the purpose of electing a chairman. Dr. Wright was elected chairman of the Committee.

Dr. Boozer suggested that the Commission approve the establishment of task forces in the areas of health, nursing, medical doctor education, and other health-related areas. Dr. Wright requested that the Committee be given the opportunity to consider the matter and to develop recommendations to the Commission.

Mr. Joseph B. Davenport, a member of the Health Education Authority, and Mr. James F. Keasler, Executive Director of the Appalachian Health Systems Agency, commented briefly with reference to cooperation and coordination among the various agencies and professions concerned with health and medical education, and the effective functions HEA has performed in this connection.

Dr. Boozer distributed copies of the draft of a Bill to amend the Act that established the Dean's Committee on Medical Doctor Education. He noted that he has been invited to appear, along with several other interested parties, at a joint meeting of the Senate Medical Affairs Committee and the House Medical, Military, Public and Municipal Affairs Committee on December 13 with respect to the proposed legislation. Mr. Clement requested that a member of the Commission, rather than the Executive Director, represent the Commission at the hearing. Dr. Boozer suggested that the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Health and Medical Education for further study, and that the Committee designate a member of the Commission or the staff to make the presentation on December 13.

V. Consideration of Rules and Procedures of the Commission

It was moved (Wilkins) and seconded (Dreher) that the revised Rules and Procedures of the Commission be approved. The motion was adopted unanimously. The revised Rules and Procedures, as adopted, are attached as Exhibit A.

VI. Report on Planning Activities

Mr. Swanson reported that 16 task forces held meetings in November. The chairman of each task force commented briefly on activities and progress. Task forces on the Appropriation Formula, Facilities, Faculty, Finances, Goals, Libraries,

and Transfer Students have scheduled meetings during December. Dr. Boozer expressed appreciation to Mr. Michael, Mrs. Shelton, and other members of the staff for the work they have done in corresponding with members of the task forces and in coordinating meetings. Mr. Swanson complimented Commission members for their efforts in organizing the task forces.

Mr. Swanson noted that public hearings will be held in January and February in each of the six Congressional Districts, in accordance with Act 410 of 1978.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Gaylon Syrett
Recording Secretary