

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

March 2, 1978
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 Noon

PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dr. R. Cathcart Smith, Chairman
Mr. Arthur J. H. Clement, Jr.
Mrs. Wanda L. Forbes
Mr. Robert C. Gallagher
Mrs. Nancy D. Hawk
Mr. Paul W. McAlister
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. Arthur M. Swanson
Mr. T. Emmet Walsh

MEMBER OF THE PRESS

Ms. Warren McInnis

GUESTS

Dr. Thomas E. Barton, Jr.
Mr. G. William Dudley, Jr.
Mr. A. D. Hutto
Mr. L. Roger Kirk, Jr.
Mr. George Leventis
Mr. J. Lacy McLean
Miss Frances H. Miller
Dr. M. Maceo Nance, Jr.
Dr. Robert H. White
Mr. W. Louis Williams

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Mr. William C. Jennings
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Mr. Alan S. Krech
Mr. Cannon R. Mayes
Mr. James R. Michael
Mr. John J. Powers
Mr. James L. Solomon, Jr.
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett
Mrs. Judi R. Tillman

I. Introductions

Dr. Smith introduced Mr. Robert C. Gallagher who was appointed to the Commission on January 13, 1978, as successor to Mr. Colvin. Dr. Smith welcomed Dr. Nance who recently was elected Chairman of the Council of Presidents of Public Senior Colleges and Universities, and will represent that group at Commission meetings.

II. Minutes of January 5, 1978, Commission Meeting

It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Pratt) that the minutes of the January 5, 1978, Commission meeting be approved as written. The motion was adopted.

III. Ratification of Mail Ballot Action Approving Three Degree Programs

Dr. Kinard stated that the mail ballot conducted on three proposals for new programs early in February resulted in approval by the Commission of the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Program Development. The staff recommended that this action be ratified, for the record, as follows:

1. that a new program leading to the Associate in Business degree with major

in Court Reporting at Midlands Technical College be approved as submitted;

2. that a new program leading to the Associate in Engineering Technology degree with major in Mechanical Engineering Technology at Aiken Technical College be approved as submitted;
3. that a new program leading to the Master of Science in Nursing degree at the Medical University of South Carolina with options in Maternity Nursing, Pediatric Nursing, Medical-Surgical Nursing (gerontology, oncology, or critical care), Community Health Nursing, and Psychiatric-Mental Health Nursing be approved subject to the following conditions:
 - a. that initiation of the program will be contingent upon prior recruitment of a program coordinator and the appropriate new faculty with sufficient lead time to develop the curriculum and prepare the necessary courses;
 - b. that the different tracks may be phased-in over several years and not necessarily introduced simultaneously;
 - c. that the master's program in nurse midwifery be given high priority, but that the existing certificate program should not necessarily be eliminated. The decision to drop the certificate program should be made with time, on its own merits, and after careful consideration of the impact on need;
 - d. that plans should be made for intensive first-hand exposure of students in psychiatric nursing to the realities in the behavior and the care of the mentally ill and the retarded patients.

It was moved (Scarborough) and seconded (Hawk) that the action of the mail ballot concerning three proposals for new programs, as stated above, be ratified. The motion was approved.

IV. Consideration of Proposals from Greenville Technical College to Offer Three Baccalaureate Degree Programs

Dr. Smith stated that a question has been raised concerning the propriety of action by the Commission on the three proposals from Greenville Technical College in view of the recent legislation (S.251) providing for the restructuring of the Commission. He stated that the Bill probably would not be signed into law by the Governor until March 3 or later, and until that time the Commission, as presently constituted, will remain the official coordinating agency. He noted that Dr. Barton had appeared before the Commission on December 8, and that a proposal had subsequently been submitted. He also noted that the matter was placed on the agenda of the March meeting prior to the action of the Legislature on S.251, and expressed the view that the Commission should take action as scheduled.

Mr. Clement stated that the Commission has spent considerable time and effort in studying the proposals. If action is taken at this time, it will still be necessary for the matter to be considered by the new Commission. He commented that consideration of these proposals now would be a futile use of the present

Commission's time. Mr. Marchant expressed the view that the present Commission cannot meritoriously act on the matter, and it therefore should be deferred until the new Commission can consider it in connection with the Statewide master plan mandated by the legislation. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Prioleau) that the three proposals be deleted from the agenda and deferred to a subsequent meeting of the new Commission.

Mr. Walsh stated that any decision concerning the proposals should be made by the General Assembly and should be considered in the over-all context of their effect on higher education in the State. Mr. Quattlebaum stated that if the Commission takes the position that action at this time on the three proposals can be reversed by the new Commission, it is also true that action taken on any other matter can be reversed. He commented that if that is the case, the meeting should be adjourned at once. Mr. Prioleau stated that other items on the agenda are relatively routine, but the proposals from Greenville Technical College call for a major decision concerning the future of higher education in the State. He stated that since the General Assembly does not have confidence in the Commission as it is presently constituted, the Commission should not make such an important decision on the eve of its departure.

Mrs. Hawk noted that the Bill provides for a moratorium of one year on expansion of curricula and construction. She stated that the new Commission might be grateful for a decision made today, and that the Commission had in fact been studying this matter for three months.

The motion that the three proposals be deleted from the agenda was approved, with seven voting in favor and six opposing. Mr. McAlister abstained from voting.

Dr. Smith introduced Mr. W. Louis Williams, Chairman of the Greenville County Technical Education Commission. Mr. Williams stated that he recognizes the Commission's position and is satisfied with the action taken, even though a moratorium will be placed on new programs. He stated that the study made by the Commission staff was conducted in a fair and professional manner, and that those staff members should be commended on the way they represented the Commission.

Dr. Smith stated that as Chairman he regrets that the matter was deleted from the agenda. He commented that in removing ex officio members from the Commission the Legislature has excluded some of the State's most knowledgeable citizens in the field of education. He noted that he does not interpret S.251 as indicating lack of confidence in the Commission, but merely as a change in the process of selecting members.

V. Consideration of Five-year Plan of the Commission on Higher Education

Dr. Boozer stated that several months ago Governor Edwards created the Office of State Planning and appointed Mr. P. C. Smith as Director. Last fall Dr. Jesse A. Coles, Jr., Deputy Superintendent of Education for Administration and Planning, joined Mr. Smith's staff as State Planning Officer. Mr. Smith and Dr. Coles developed a format and instructions for agencies to follow in preparing five-year plans, and in December, 1977, promulgated the directive to which agencies will respond. Essentially each agency will develop a five-year budget plan. Using the latest approved budget request as a reference, the plan will identify changes proposed by the agency. Each year the five-year plan will be updated

and moved forward one year. In addition, the Commission staff has worked closely with the Office of State Planning in its relationship with the colleges and universities. Copies of their five-year plans will be submitted to the Commission staff, which will in turn provide comments to the Planning Office.

Commission members were provided, on February 22, copies of a draft "Five-year Program Plan for 1979-80 through 1983-84" for the Commission on Higher Education. The draft was reviewed and approved by the Executive Committee. It was moved (McAlister) and seconded (Shirley) that the draft five-year plan be approved and transmitted to the Office of State Planning. The motion was adopted. Mr. Walsh noted that if the Commission carries out all the duties set forth in the plan, it will be necessary to have an expanded staff and greater funding in future years.

VI. Consideration of Proposed Resolution Concerning the Federal "State Student Incentive Grant Program" (SSIG)

Dr. Boozer stated that the State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) Program was authorized by PL 92-318, the Federal Higher Education Amendments of 1972, to encourage states to create or expand their own student financial aid programs. Through the SSIG Program, federal funds, to be matched on a one-to-one basis by each state, are provided for grants to students who need financial assistance for their postsecondary education. Federal funds for this program were first made available in 1974. In order to participate, South Carolina was required to designate a single agency to administer the SSIG Program in the State. The Tuition Grants Committee was designated by Governor West as South Carolina's SSIG agency. Under the original Federal legislation, it was permitted but not required that students at both public and private institutions be eligible. Because the Tuition Grants Program is restricted to State residents attending certain private institutions in South Carolina, all SSIG awards have been made each year to students attending the private colleges.

A provision in the 1976 Amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 requires that the SSIG Program in each state be opened to students attending all non-profit postsecondary institutions in the state. This provision was intended to produce equity in the distribution of Federal SSIG awards. The Higher Education Tuition Grants Committee, on February 8, 1977, submitted a proposal concerning the SSIG Program to the Permanent Joint Legislative Committee to Make Recommendations on the Distribution of Federal Student Aid in South Carolina, a committee established in 1977 by the General Assembly primarily to consider questions relating to the distribution of SSIG funds in the State. In summary, the Tuition Grants Committee proposed that:

1. the Tuition Grants Committee remain the designated State agency to administer the SSIG Program in South Carolina (1979-80 and beyond);
2. Federal SSIG funds in the amount of \$776,000, approximately the amount of Federal SSIG dollars expected in South Carolina for 1978-79, should be reserved in each future year for the Tuition Grants Committee to make awards to State residents attending eligible private institutions;
3. Federal SSIG funds remaining in each future year after \$776,000 has been reserved for Tuition Grants should be divided equally between students attending private and public colleges in the State; and

4. each public institution should provide from its own resources matching dollars for SSIG awards to its students. [State appropriated funds are used by the Tuition Grants Committee as matching funds. State law prohibits public institutions from using appropriated funds for scholarship purposes.]

Because the Tuition Grants proposal would not produce the intended equity in South Carolina but would, instead, result in only token opening of the program to students attending public institutions, the staff recommended that the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education submit an alternate proposal concerning the distribution of SSIG funds in the State. Commission members were provided, on February 22, copies of such a proposed resolution (Exhibit A). It was moved (Prioleau) and seconded (Scarborough) that the resolution be approved and submitted to the Permanent Joint Legislative Committee to Make Recommendations on the Distribution of Federal Student Aid in South Carolina.

Mr. Walsh stated that it is probable that the Federal legislation will be revised during the coming year. He commented that the resolution does not take into consideration the State subsidy of \$2,200 which is provided to every student attending a State institution, whether or not it is needed. Dr. Boozer stated that in the implementation of the SSIG Program in most other states, the private colleges have been discriminated against and most of the funds have been awarded to public college students; in South Carolina, however, the public colleges have not had access to the program. Mr. Walsh expressed the view that every student, whether attending a public or a private institution, should have access to the program, but it might be well to defer action until Congress has considered the matter and the Federal appropriation has been made. Dr. Boozer stated that the South Carolina Joint Legislative Committee is considering at this time what the posture of the State should be in the administration of the program in future years, and the staff recommends that an alternative proposal be submitted soon to that Committee for consideration. If the Commission defers action, legislation might be enacted in South Carolina that would not be in accord with Federal intent.

Mr. McAlister stated that South Carolina has an obligation to administer the program in accordance with Federal legislation as it now stands. Mrs. Hawk stated that it is important that sufficient funds continue to be made available to needy students attending private institutions in the State. She suggested that the resolution be worded to protect funds for these students. Dr. Boozer stated that the basic purpose of the Tuition Grants Program is to provide funds for private college students. He noted that the federally funded SSIG Program is in addition to the Tuition Grants Program and does not diminish State Tuition Grant funds. Mr. Mayes, Coordinator of Student Affairs on the Commission's staff, stated that there is no possibility that the public institutions would be awarded all the SSIG funds, because the program would be operated on the basis of need of individual students. He noted that in most states in which the program has been opened to both public and private institutions, the funds have been awarded almost equally between students in the two sectors.

Mr. Walsh stated that the Tuition Grants Program and the SSIG Program must be considered together to avoid creating greater inequities. He commented that it is in the best interests of the State to maintain a balanced program of

financial aid to students at both public and private institutions. A substitute motion was made (Walsh) and seconded (Forbes) that the Commission go on record as recommending to the Joint Legislative Committee that it consider ways and means of incorporating the public institutions into the SSIG Program so as to have a fair distribution of funds to both sectors. Dr. Boozer stated that the substitute motion would not change the basic intent of the resolution; the staff proposal goes into sufficient detail to present the historical information so that the Committee might understand the rationale behind the recommendation. The substitute motion was disapproved.

The motion that the resolution be approved and submitted to the Joint Legislative Committee was adopted.

VII. Report on FY-1978 Funding of Title VI-A Applications (Undergraduate Instructional Equipment)

Mr. Solomon reported that Congress has appropriated \$7.5 million for the Title VI-A Undergraduate Instructional Equipment Grants program in FY-1978. As a result, South Carolina has been allocated \$105,561 for funding of FY-1978 Title VI-A applications -- \$84,449 under Category I (laboratory and other special equipment) and \$21,112 under Category II (television equipment for closed-circuit direct instruction). Procedures for establishing priority ranking of applications for funding, as well as funding levels, are specified in detail in the South Carolina State Plan for Title VI-A, adopted by the Commission on September 10, 1976, and approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education on November 5, 1976. Based upon the priority rankings of eligible projects and the amount of funds available, 11 projects under Category I and three projects under Category II qualify for funding (Exhibit B). In compliance with Title VI-A regulations, these projects will be forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education by March 31, 1978, with the recommendations that they be funded. Dr. Smith stated that this is an informational item requiring no action by the Commission.

VIII. Report on Status of Higher Education Legislation

Mr. Michael reported that the Higher Education Bill (S.251 -- Exhibit C), providing for the restructuring of the Commission on Higher Education, was ratified on February 28 and bears ratification number R.435. The Governor is expected to approve it within the next few days.

Copies of a summary legislative report (Exhibit D), concerning Bills relating to higher education considered during the Second Session of the 1978 General Assembly, were distributed to Commission members. This item was on the agenda for information only and required no action by the Commission.

IX. Report of the Committee on Facilities and Federal Programs

Mr. Clement requested, on behalf of the Committee on Facilities and Federal Programs, that an additional item be placed on the agenda. It was moved (Clement) and seconded (Marchant) that because of the urgency of the matter the Commission consider the recommendation of the Committee at this time. The motion was approved.

Mr. Quattlebaum, chairman of the Committee, reported that at its meeting prior to the Commission meeting the Committee discussed a proposal by Clemson University to construct a minimum of 500 housing units, to be financed through revenue bonds. After studying a detailed analysis of the housing situation at

Clemson, and in accordance with the staff recommendation, the Committee approved the proposal and recommended that the Commission give favorable consideration to the request. It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Shirley) that the proposal be approved by the Commission. The motion was adopted.

X. Report of the Executive Director

Dr. Boozer expressed appreciation to the Commission, on behalf of the staff, for the Commission's support of the staff during the past several years and for its many contributions to the public good of the State. He commented that the only significant compensation Commission members have received for making the trip to Columbia each month and for always being available on call has been the satisfaction of performing a public service. He expressed the hope that the staff may continue to call upon Commission members, and that they will also feel free to continue to call upon the Commission's staff in the future.

President Nance expressed appreciation to the Commission, as Chairman of and on behalf of the Council of Presidents of Public Senior Colleges and Universities, for having worked diligently with the Council of Presidents toward the mutual goal of providing quality higher education to the State.

Dr. Smith stated that in response and on behalf of the Commission he appreciated the work of the staff and its support of the Commission. He also expressed appreciation to both the Commission and the staff for the support they have given him as Chairman during the past five years. He noted that the legislation providing for the restructuring of the Commission does not provide for the orderly transfer of certain duties that must be performed before the new Commission is appointed. He stated that he plans to discuss the matter with Governor Edwards within the next few days.

Mr. Walsh endorsed Dr. Smith's comments and expressed his appreciation to the staff for the competent manner in which it has worked for the best interests of higher education in South Carolina and the thoroughness with which it has carried out its duties. He complimented Dr. Smith on the capable manner in which he has presided over Commission meetings, on his ability to express precisely the views of the Commission, and on his many contributions to the furtherance of higher education in the State. He stated that the ex officio members have also made valuable contributions to higher education through their knowledge of their specific institutions and their ability to place the institutions above their own personal feelings.

Mr. Clement noted that the February, 1978, issue of Grapevine, published by the Department of Educational Administration, Illinois State University, contains an excerpt from a statement by Dr. Smith, reprinted from the Commission's December, 1977, Higher Education Newsletter. He complimented Dr. Smith on the statement, and requested that the minutes reflect his comments. Dr. Pratt stated that he also read the statement with pride. It was the consensus that Mr. Prioleau, in the following remarks to Dr. Smith, expressed the views of the full Commission: "You have done a superb job in presiding over this body. It has not been easy, and there have been times when you have exhibited considerable patience. You have been conscientious, diligent about your duties, and always well prepared. You have offered real leadership but have never

tried to dominate. You have given all Commission members the opportunity to speak when they wished to do so, and you have always been courteous and fair."

It was moved (Prioleau) and seconded (Marchant) and unanimously voted that the meeting be adjourned with a standing vote of appreciation to Dr. Smith for his outstanding service to the State of South Carolina in his capacity as Chairman of the Commission on Higher Education.

Respectfully submitted,


Gaylon Syrett
Recording Secretary