

MINUTES OF MEETING  
OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

September 4, 1975  
11:00 a.m. - 1:20 p.m.

## PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dr. R. Cathcart Smith, Chairman  
Mr. M. Calhoun Colvin  
Dr. Marianna W. Davis  
Dr. William C. Draffin  
Mrs. Wanda L. Forbes  
Mr. Gedney M. Howe, Jr.  
Mr. P. Mitchell Johnson  
Mr. William F. Prioleau  
Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum  
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, Jr.  
Mr. J. Clyde Shirley  
Mr. I. P. Stanback  
Mr. T. Emmet Walsh

GUESTS

Dr. Larry A. Jackson  
Mr. L. Roger Kirk  
Mr. J. Lacy McLean  
Miss Frances H. Miller  
Dr. Charles E. Palmer  
Dr. R. Wright Spears  
Dr. Robert E. White

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer  
Mr. Charles A. Brooks, Jr.  
Mr. Horace F. Byrne  
Mrs. Clara W. Evans  
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  
Ms. Rosita M. Ramsey  
Mr. James L. Solomon, Jr.  
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett  
Mrs. Judi R. Tillman

MEMBER OF THE PRESS

Ms. Warren McInnis

I. Introductions

Dr. Smith introduced Mrs. Wanda L. Forbes and Mr. M. Calhoun Colvin, appointed to the Commission by Governor Edwards on July 29, 1975, to replace Mr. Stan Smith and Mr. Fred Sheheen, respectively. Dr. Smith read a statement welcoming these new members and expressing appreciation to Mr. Smith and Mr. Sheheen (Exhibit A). It was moved (Johnson) and seconded (Davis) and unanimously voted that the Commission present certificates of appreciation to Mr. Sheheen and Mr. Smith. Dr. Smith indicated that he planned also to provide them with copies of his statement.

Dr. Smith announced that he had appointed Mr. Quattlebaum to replace Mr. Sheheen as chairman of the Committee on Academic Program Development, and Mr. Walsh to replace Mr. Wienges as chairman of the Committee on Legislative Relations. He noted that, as committee chairmen, Mr. Quattlebaum and Mr. Walsh were now also members of the Executive Committee, along with Mr. Chapman, Mr. Howe, and Dr. Smith. The Chairman stated that he will make new committee appointments in November, and requested that the new Commission members communicate with him or with Dr. Boozer concerning their special areas of interest.

## II. Approval of Minutes of July 10, 1975, Commission Meeting

Dr. Davis requested that her remarks not be condensed to the extent which they had been in the discussion of the A.E.T. program in nuclear technology at Denmark Technical Education Center (minutes of the July 10, 1975, CHE meeting, p. 150). Dr. Smith stated that such discussions were necessarily summarized for the minutes. Dr. Davis requested permission to extend her remarks further. It was moved (Shirley) and seconded (Stanback) to approve the minutes of the July 10, 1975, Commission meeting, with Dr. Davis' additional comments. The motion was adopted.

## III. Consideration of Academic Programs

### a. B.S. Degree in Nursing - USC-Spartanburg

Dr. Fulton reported that the Health Education Authority and the staff recommended approval of the proposed program, for implementation in the fall of 1976, with the stipulation that the new dean and faculty be given sufficient time to plan the curriculum prior to beginning the new program. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Scarborough) that the program be approved, as recommended.

Dr. Davis stated that in her view the Commission would be approving a program before examining the curriculum. Dr. Boozer stated that historically the Commission has not become involved with the details of curriculum, but has viewed its role in terms of determining the need for a program and acting on it on that basis. Mr. Johnson stated that the curriculum is the sole responsibility of the board of trustees of each institution. Dr. Davis stated that the curriculum helps to determine many other aspects of a program, and if curriculum is bypassed other kinds of concerns are also bypassed.

Dr. Kinard stated that, although details of curriculum are not a proper subject for concern of the Statewide coordinating agency, which generally addresses itself to questions of need, demand, cost, and the appropriate role of the institution, the "Policy and Procedures Concerning New Programs" adopted by

the Commission in May, 1975, call for a sample curriculum format to be provided by the institutions. He noted that it is possible in some instances to understand more about the program by examining the various components of the curriculum than by studying the information provided by the institution in its proposal. Dr. Fulton stated that the Health Education Authority and the Statewide Master Planning Committee on Nursing Education do discuss curricula in the course of their deliberations.

Mr. Walsh inquired concerning the relationship between the Associate Degree program at the two-year level and the proposed baccalaureate program. Dr. Fulton stated that the two programs will work together in an innovative approach which is being used at only a few institutions in the country. The motion to approve the program, as recommended, was adopted.

b. One-year Diploma Program in Practical Nursing - Beaufort Technical Education Center

Dr. Fulton reported that the Health Education Authority and the staff recommended approval, for implementation in January, 1976, with the stipulation that the first class be limited to 12 students. It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Johnson) and unanimously voted that the program be approved, as recommended.

c. A.Bus. (Legal Assistant) - Midlands Technical College

Mr. Krech reported that at the July 10 meeting of the Commission a decision on this proposed program was "deferred with a request that the staff of Midlands Technical College confer with and obtain comments and recommendations from the faculty of the law school of the University of South Carolina." Commission members were provided letters and minutes of the Legal Assistant Advisory Committee meeting at Midlands Technical College which verify that the Legal Assistant Program has the endorsement of faculty members of the USC Law Center. The staff recommended approval. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (Stanback) and unanimously voted to approve the program, as recommended.

d. Associate in Occupational Technology Degree (A.O.T.)  
(Vocational-Technical Education) - All 16 SBTCE Institutions

Mr. Krech reported the staff recommendation that SBTCE be authorized to implement the program in only the 12 institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (Chesterfield-Marlboro Technical College, Florence-Darlington Technical College, Greenville Technical College, Horry-Georgetown Technical Education Center, Midlands Technical College, Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College, Piedmont Technical College, Spartanburg Technical College, Sumter Area Technical College, Tri-County Technical College, Trident Technical College, and York Technical College). The staff further recommended that this authorization be granted

with the following stipulations: (1) that the staff of SBTCE maintain a strong role in the development, monitoring, and evaluation of this program, as outlined in the proposal; and (2) that a report on the effectiveness and productivity of the program in the several institutions be submitted to the Commission on Higher Education in July, 1977, with the understanding that the program will be terminated at any institutions where the need for it has not been demonstrated. It was moved (Scarborough) and seconded (Johnson) that the program be approved at the 12 institutions, as recommended.

Dr. Davis stated that those institutions which are accredited are those which have been fortunate enough to get certain programs so that they might qualify. She expressed concern that implementation of the program at only the institutions which have been accredited would be unfair to the other four institutions, and stated her view that one criterion for accreditation is that an institution must have a sufficient number of programs.

Dr. Boozer stated that the proposed program is essentially an inservice training program for faculty in the technical institutions and the vocational education centers. He noted that among the criteria for accreditation considerable emphasis is placed upon the facilities, the library, and the qualifications of the faculty; whether or not an institution has a particular program is not a central point in the requirements for accreditation.

Dr. Smith asked if the program is self-terminating. Dr. Palmer stated that inservice training for faculty is the basis for the new faculty and staff development program for the entire SBTCE system. He indicated that faculty members who do not have degrees are required to participate in a faculty-staff development program in order to move from one salary schedule to another within the SBTCE faculty compensation plan. He noted that until the other four institutions (at Aiken, Beaufort, Denmark, and Williamsburg) are accredited, they will participate in a faculty-staff development program on a course-by-course basis, under the guidance and supervision of the SBTCE central office. The program was approved, as recommended.

#### IV. Report of Study of Productivity of Graduate Programs

Dr. Kinard reported that the study of the productivity of certain graduate degree programs at the public senior institutions has been completed. In April, 1973, the Commission called into question those degree programs which had in the period 1966-67 through 1971-72 failed to produce an average of two or more graduates per year for master's programs and of one or more graduates per year for doctoral programs. Institutional recommendations, with which the staff concurs, on each of the programs are summarized in Tables I, II, and III (Exhibit B). As a result of the study, Clemson University

has discontinued, effective with the 1975-76 academic year, its graduate programs in Chemical Physics, and in Materials and Water Resources Engineering. The University further suggested that its programs in Animal, Dairy, and Poultry Science be combined into a new program leading to the Master of Science in Animal Science and Food Industries. Clemson will submit a formal proposal describing this new program.

The University of South Carolina has proposed to discontinue four programs (in Clinical Psychology, Community Psychology, Counselor Education, and Foundations of Education). USC also proposed that five specialities in engineering (Bio-Engineering, Electronics Systems Engineering, Energy Conversion Engineering, Materials Engineering, and Structural Engineering) be subsumed under the four traditional engineering areas of Civil, Electrical, Mechanical, or Chemical Engineering. The two institutions suggested that six programs -- five at Clemson and one at USC -- again be reviewed by each institution at prescribed times. The staff recommended that all of these program actions be approved by the Commission.

Mr. Johnson asked if money will be saved by merging programs. Dr. Kinard stated that the only way substantial amounts of money will be saved is by the elimination of programs. From a long-range view, there will be a saving.

Dr. Davis commented that the purpose of such a study should not be to determine which programs are to be deleted or combined, but the need to look at all graduate programs in the State institutions in terms of where they are, where they should be, for whom they are designed, and how the needs of the State and the nation will be met through these graduate programs. She stated that some existing programs are out of date, not only in terms of the State of South Carolina but in terms of higher education in the nation. She stated that the study should be an examination of the entire system, and noted that it might be an appropriate planning study. Dr. Kinard stated that such a study has been initiated. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Howe) that the recommended program actions be approved. The motion was adopted, with Dr. Davis dissenting.

V. Informational Report on Guidelines for Compensation of Clinical Faculty in Medical Schools

Dr. Fulton reported that a meeting had been scheduled of the Presidents and key staff of the Medical University of South Carolina and the University of South Carolina on the supplementation of salaries of medical school faculty members engaging in private practice in State-supported clinical facilities. The purpose of the meeting will be to define and seek agreement on concepts that can serve as the basis for the preparation of guidelines that will accommodate the individual differences that characterize the two universities, as well as assure compliance with procedures that have national acceptability, in the absence of official

standards, federal or state regulations, or guidelines from professional organizations. The development of such guidelines was requested by the Commission at its September 5, 1974, meeting (minutes, p. 64).

Dr. Fulton stated that the Health Education Authority will initiate a method for periodic review and report to the Commission on the individual procedures and rules for supplementary compensation as established and implemented by each institution. As a part of this process, the latest version of the by-laws and constitutions applicable to supplementary compensation will be examined, and each institution will be requested to justify its own practices with reference to the guidelines and its individual situation. Dr. Smith stated that no action was required by the Commission at this time.

## VI. Consideration of Budgets

### a. Proposed 1976-77 Budget of Commission on Higher Education

Dr. Smith stated that the question was raised last year as to whether or not the Executive Committee had reviewed the Commission's budget request prior to its being presented to the full Commission. As was previously the case, this year the Executive Committee was again provided copies of the proposed budget several weeks in advance of this meeting, with ample time for the Committee to meet prior to the regular Commission meeting in order to discuss the details of the budget. Dr. Smith stated that, in the absence of any requests from members of the Executive Committee for such a meeting, he assumed that there were no significant questions concerning this year's budget.

Mr. Michael stated that the budget request being presented to the Commission at this time is 6.8 percent less than the budget request approved by the Commission a year ago. He noted that all line items have been approved by the Commission in prior years, with the exception of the student intern program, which in the past has not been a separately budgeted line item. He stated that major increases are the same as those approved by the Commission, but not funded, last year. He noted that the request reflected the Commission's increased activity in comprehensive planning, and that a significant part of the increase in the administrative budget would provide for the addition to the staff of three higher education specialists as well as expanded staff capabilities through increased employment of consultants. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (Walsh) that the budget request be approved, as recommended.

Mr. Quattlebaum stated his concern that the Commission would be asking for a budgetary increase while cautioning the institutions to reduce their requests. Dr. Smith stated that he has carefully examined the budget and believes that it represents a realistic statement of the Commission's needs.

Dr. Boozer reiterated that the request is 6.8 percent under the budget request approved by the Commission and recommended to the Budget and Control Board a year ago. He noted that mandated items which cannot be reduced are included in the request, and that the workload of the staff has increased considerably with the initiation of planning activities under the 1202 Commission.

Mr. Howe stated that if the Commission intelligently considers the requests of the institutions, it will necessarily be through an informed and an adequate staff. Dr. Davis commented in favor of an adequate and professional staff.

Mr. Colvin inquired concerning the checks and balances or audit procedures used for determining the staff's efficiency. Dr. Boozer stated that the administration of the staff is his responsibility, that in carrying out this responsibility he is in regular and close consultation with the Executive Committee, and that he continuously monitors the work and performance of the staff. Dr. Smith noted that the Commission itself serves as an auditor of staff performance. Mr. Colvin stated that the audit level of the Commission is one of policy, whereas he is seeking information about audit procedures at a level below that. Dr. Smith requested that Mr. Colvin present his questions again at the November meeting of the Commission for further consideration.

The motion to approve the budget request of the Commission on Higher Education, as recommended, was adopted. Mr. Prioleau requested that the record show he did not vote concerning the Commission's budget.

b. Recommendation from the Council of Presidents of Public Colleges and Universities Concerning Step 10 of the Appropriation Formula

At its June 5, 1975, meeting the Commission voted that Step 10 of the Formula be tentatively approved and that the matter be referred to the Council of Presidents of the Public Colleges and Universities for its recommendation to the Commission for possible revision at the September CHE meeting. In a letter to Dr. Boozer, dated August 25, 1975, President Jackson reported that:

"After referral of the issue of possible amendments to Step 10 of the formula to the Vice Presidents for Finance, the Council of Presidents has determined that the complexities of amendment require further detailed examination.

"During the course of the examination it became clear that each college or university has some unique requirement as to debt servicing, mission, or special circumstance relating to the life or long-standing

tradition of the institution that has a main impact on the structure of its fee schedule.

"Before the Council can recommend new procedures with assurance, the impact of any change has to be more carefully examined. Therefore, the Council of Presidents requests that it be granted a continuance on this matter for one year and that no change in the wording of Step 10 be implemented for FY 1977. A specific recommendation will be made to the Commission on Higher Education prior to consideration of the FY 1977-78 budget."

Dr. Boozer requested that a definite date be established for the Council of Presidents to make its recommendation to the Commission. Dr. Jackson stated that the recommendation will be made no later than May 1, 1976. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (Johnson) that the Commission approve the request of the Council of Presidents, as stated. The motion was adopted.

c. 1976-77 Budget Requests Received from the Colleges and Universities (Steps 12 and 13 of the Appropriation Formula)

At the request of the Chairman to comment on the fiscal outlook, Mr. Kirk stated that \$50 million must be cut in the appropriations already made to State agencies in order to balance this year's budget; and, further, based on forecasts at the present time, \$75 million less in revenues will be available for next year's budget than will be available this year. He stated that the only alternatives are to reduce next year's appropriation by \$125 million or to increase taxes. He urged that State agencies look carefully at their budget requests before submitting them to the Budget and Control Board.

Dr. Boozer distributed copies of an addendum to the formula budget request concerning Steps 12 and 13, provided by Mr. Johnson on behalf of the College of Charleston. A summary of proposals submitted under Steps 12 and 13 by the colleges and universities is attached as Exhibit C. Mr. Quattlebaum expressed concern that the institutions were not being realistic, in light of the austere financial situation in the State. He suggested that the Commission request that the institutions place priorities on proposals in Steps 12 and 13. Mr. Shirley inquired concerning the responsibility of the Commission in apprising the institutions of the degree of austerity with which the State is now faced, for guidance in drawing up their proposed requests. He commented that the institutions should be judicial in cutting their requests before they are recommended to the Budget and Control Board. Mr. Quattlebaum suggested that Dr. Boozer write to the presidents of the colleges and universities, informing them of the lower revenue forecasts and requesting that they place priorities on items under Steps 12 and 13 for the information of the Commission.

Dr. Jackson stated that if the boards of trustees and the Commission are not ruthless in examining Steps 12 and 13, inequity can result. He noted that Lander College does not plan to submit a request under those Steps, but, should requests from other institutions be recommended to the Budget and Control Board by the Commission, and should the Budget and Control Board then make an across-the-board cut, Lander would suffer not only in Steps 12 and 13 but throughout its appropriation.

Mr. Johnson suggested that the Executive Committee meet prior to the October 8 budget meeting of the Commission in order that requests which are not appropriate under Steps 12 and 13 can be cut before being given to the full Commission. Mr. Howe stated that the role of the Executive Committee is to recommend to the Commission, and not to cut amounts requested by the institutions. Dr. Draffin stated that the State Auditor had informed him that each institution has the responsibility to submit a budget that represents the actual needs of the institution. He commented that the Budget and Control Board is responsible for making the final decisions, but that it has no way of knowing the needs of the institutions unless they are made known through requests.

Mr. Johnson stated that the Commission's mission is not to decide how much money each institution should receive, but to determine an equitable distribution of funds.

Dr. Davis inquired concerning requests under Steps 12 and 13 which are partially funded from sources other than State appropriations. She stated that such information could affect the need for the requested amount in State appropriations and expressed the view that the Commission should be provided such data. Mr. Jennings stated that often there are other sources of revenue, and the fact that State funding is requested does not mean that the State necessarily should provide the funds. He noted that information concerning federal funds is included in the detailed budget which each institution and agency must provide to the Budget and Control Board. Dr. Smith stated that the staff will make an effort to provide such information, if it is available.

Dr. Boozer discussed a proposed schedule of half-hour presentations by the presidents of the public colleges and universities to the Commission on October 8 and requested a motion concerning the schedule. It was moved (Johnson) and seconded (Howe) that the Commission approve the schedule of presentations, following the same pattern used last year. The motion was adopted.

## VII. Report of Executive Director

Dr. Boozer announced that the schedule for the Commission's Annual Report had been moved forward two or three months by the State Printing Office, preventing the staff from being able to provide the Commission with a draft copy, as has been done in past years. He distributed copies of a draft outline of the table of contents and asked that the Commission approve the

general format of the report, which will be the same as in prior years. He noted that the State prescribes the type of report which can be used. A copy of the draft of the report will be mailed to the Commission members when available. It was moved (Davis) and seconded (Quattlebaum) and unanimously voted to approve the outline.

Dr. Boozer stated that, according to Commission policy adopted in 1973, a consulting assignment by a member of the staff must be approved by the full Commission. He announced that Mr. Mayes, who is active in regional and national groups in the area of student financial aid, has been invited to serve as a management review consultant for a statewide study of student financial aid in Florida. The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education is initiating the same kind of study, with Mr. Mayes serving as the key staff member. Dr. Boozer recommended that the Commission permit him to authorize Mr. Mayes to accept the assignment, with a proviso that if work is required of him during the work week for which he receives an honorarium, he will take annual leave or leave without pay. It was moved (Scarborough) and seconded (Walsh) and unanimously voted to approve the recommendation. Dr. Smith stated that the Commission might wish to review its policy at a later date regarding consulting by staff members to determine if any changes in that policy are needed.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Gaylon Syrett*  
Gaylon Syrett  
Recording Secretary