EXHIBIT B

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
1333 MAIN STREET
SUITE 650
COLUMBIA, S. C. 29201

HOWARD R. BOOZER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE
803/758-2407

July 7, 1986

TO: Members, Commission on Higher Education

FROM: Frank E. Kinard FEK

Minority Report on "Centers of Excellence" Recommendations To Be Considered July 10 (Agenda Item 4.a.)

At the request of Dr. Taylor, Chairman of the Committee on Academic Affairs, there is enclosed a copy of a report from Dr. Lewis. This constitutes a minority report dissenting from the report of the Committee on Academic Affairs on awards for "Centers of Excellence" for FY 86-87. This item is to be considered as Agenda Item 4.a. at your meeting on July 10.

Please bring this material with you along with related materials sent to you last week in preparation for the meeting.

FEK:as

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Charles A. Brooks, Jr.
Academic Affairs Staff

June 26, 1986

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Nelle Taylor, Chairman
Academic Affairs Committee
Commission on Higher Education

FROM: Alba M. Lewis

SUBJECT: Minority Report

As a member of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Commission on Higher Education, I hereby request that I be permitted to file the attached minority report regarding the Committee's recommendations ensuing from its meeting of June 26, 1986.

I hereby request that the attached minority report accompany the report of the Committee when the latter report is disseminated to the Commission or be separately disseminated, if the former is not possible, prior to the Commission meeting at which the Committee report is presented.

Attachment

Minority Report
Academic Affairs Committee
Commission on Higher Education
Alba M. Lewis

I. Background

The Academic Affairs Committee of the C.H.E. met Thursday, June 26, 1986 to consider 11 proposals submitted by the colleges and universities for the "Centers of Excellence" awards. Only the chairperson of the committee (Mrs. Taylor) and three other committee members were present. The chairperson chose not to vote thus leaving the decisions up to the three other members who were present.

The academic affairs staff of the C.H.E. plus a representative of the State Department of Education had studied all of the proposals, ranked them, and recommended that the first three proposals (from U.S.C.-Columbia, from U.S.C.-Spartanburg, and from Clemson) be funded. In the event that the committee would prefer to fund only continuation grants the panel recommended the proposals of U.S.C.-Spartanburg, Clemson, and Furman - in that order.

The committee then considered the proposals. A motion that I made to accept the staff's recommendations was not seconded. A motion to approve the U.S.C.-Spartanburg proposal then passed 3-0. A motion to approve the Clemson proposal then failed 1-2 (mine being the dissenting vote). A motion to pass the Furman proposal then passed 3-0 as did a motion to approve the Winthrop proposal. Finally, a motion to approve the joint proposal of Francis Marion and U.S.C. Coastal passed 2-1 (mine being the dissenting vote).

The final result, therefore, was that two of the top three proposals, as ranked initially by the staff, were not recommended for funding while proposals ranked as low as ninth were so recommended.

II. Recommendations

Among the facts that I ask you to consider are the following:

1. Only three members of the Committee were present and voting.

2. The ranking that resulted from the voting was greatly at variance from that recommended by the staff.

3. It is important to support our professional staff unless they have clearly misunderstood or failed to implement our intent (which was not the case).

4. It is important to maintain credibility with the institutions, their faculties and their administrators, and to secure from them the cooperation that we and the State need.

I therefore recommend that the Commission adopt either the initial or the alternate recommendation of the staff panel.