

**Minutes of  
HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE  
September 20, 2007 (Second Meeting), 3:00 p.m.  
SC Commission on Higher Education Offices  
Columbia, South Carolina**

*In attendance:*

**Study Committee Members Present**

Mr. Daniel Ravenel, *Chair*  
Mr. J. Boone Aiken, III  
Col. Claude Eichelberger  
Representative Jerry Govan  
Dr. Doris R. Helms  
Mr. Scott Ludlow  
Dr. Layton McCurdy  
Dr. John Montgomery  
Mr. Robert W. Marlowe

**Study Committee Members Absent**

none

**CHE Staff**

Dr. Garrison Walters, Executive Director  
Mr. Reginald Adams  
Ms. Camille Brown  
Mr. Michael Brown  
Ms. Julie Carullo  
Ms. Alyson Goff  
Mr. Gary Glenn  
Ms. Lorna Manglona-Williams  
Dr. Tajuana Massie  
Dr. Gail Morrison  
Dr. Mike Raley  
Ms. Beth Rogers  
Ms. Karen Wham  
Dr. Karen Woodfaulk

**Guests:**

Ms. Joren Bartlett, S.C. Technical College  
System  
Ms. Charmeka Bosket, Governor's Office  
Mr. Jim Byrd, S.C. Independent Colleges and  
Universities  
Dr. Kathy Coleman, Clemson University  
Mr. Charlie FitzSimons  
Ms. Nicole Ford-Jennings, House Ways &  
Means Committee  
Mr. Michael Hollings, Lander University  
Ms. Karen Jones, Winthrop University  
Ms. Julie Lybrand, House Education &  
Public Works Committee  
Ms. Casey Martin, USC  
Ms. Lisa McGill, MUSC  
Ms. Robin Moseley, Senate Education  
Committee  
Mr. Craig Parks, Senate Finance Committee  
Mr. Eddie Shannon, S.C. Tuition Grants  
Mr. Mark Sweatman, MUSC

*Agenda Item 1, Call to Order and Introductions:* Mr. Daniel Ravenel called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. Ms. Julie Carullo introduced the guests and the Commission on Higher Education staff. The minutes from the September 11 meeting were approved. Mr. Ravenel thanked Ms. Beth Rogers for serving as the study committee's secretary.

*Agenda Item 2, Discussion of Meeting Schedule:* Mr. Ravenel asked the Committee to review the meeting schedule that had been set at the first meeting. The Committee affirmed the initial schedule. The next two meetings will be held October 2 and 22 at 3:00 p.m.

*Agenda Item 3, Discussion of Previous Reports and Studies:* Mr. Ravenel led the Committee in a discussion of previously mentioned reports and studies. (See *Agenda, Item 3 for listing.*) Mr. Ravenel prefaced discussion by noting that the purpose of this meeting was to focus more on procedural issues and that he hoped to come away from this meeting with a plan as to how the Committee would organize its work to accomplish its charge. In opening the discussion, Mr. Ravenel noted Kentucky and Virginia had strong state plans and asked members to look at these. Information on Kentucky's goals was distributed. A general discussion followed.

Mr. Scott Ludlow stated that the Committee needed to start the work by asking themselves, "What are the expectations of this committee?" He stated the need to identify first the state's needs and suggested the Committee ask Mr. George Fletcher of New Carolina to assist in identifying the needs. Committee members noted that the same needs and issues seem to surface in each of the state's studies, with affordability and funding being key.

Mr. John Montgomery questioned the extent to which the Committee should address K-12 collaborations. Mr. Robert Marlowe stated that several coordinating programs already exist regarding K-16, one of which is the Education and Economic Development Act (EEDA). It was suggested that because of the efforts underway, the Committee may not need to spend time on this issue. Mr. Ludlow stated that perhaps focusing on collaboration between higher education institutions would be better.

Dr. McCurdy expressed his thoughts on the readings. He stated that the method for qualifying trustees and performance funding are examples of more detailed items that may warrant discussion.

Representative Govan stated that the purpose of the Study Committee is to follow through with the work of the Governor's Task Force and address the issue of higher education funding as related to higher education's ability to meet the needs of South Carolinians. He stated that affordability is probably the most important higher education issue to the citizens. He also stated that one thing that may need to be considered is a change to the law preventing non-South Carolina residents from serving on South Carolina's institutional Boards of Trustees. He stated that he would like to address need-based student aid in regard to sufficiency of program funds and allocation of available funds. Representative Govan believed the Committee could meet the deadline provided and impact the budget process. Mr. Ravenel agreed that the need-based allocation issue needs to be addressed stating that available funds currently are allocated to colleges based on full-time enrollment and not directly to students as with other state scholarships.

Following additional discussion, the committee agreed that their goal is to come up with a system of procedures that will lead to a statewide plan. Discussion of the reports and studies continued.

Dr. Doris Helms expressed her thoughts on the readings. She contrasted the focus of the Foundations for the Future study, the Governor's Task Force report and the Presidents' report and noted that Kentucky and Washington's plans were her particular favorites after extensively

reviewing statewide plans. She stated that with all the documents and data that the Committee already has, their concentration should be on organizing it and addressing the big questions.

Mr. Ravenel asked the Committee if they would like to invite various experts in to speak. Representative Govan suggested that since time is of the essence, the Committee should prioritize and organize the work first and then bring in additional people at the end if time allows. The Committee also discussed the option of a retreat and generally agreed that a retreat may be helpful to accomplishing the charge. Dr. Helms suggested outside experts may be helpful in facilitating discussion once the Committee has organized ideas and begun to develop the recommendations.

Col. Eichelberger asked if a document existed that presents all the monetary sources of higher education. Discussion followed. Dr. Helms noted if the inputs are reviewed you also know and understand all expenditures and the nature of the various types of institutions. She suggested that the cost per student credit hour using the Delaware Survey would better reveal the affordability level of the institution. Mr. Marlowe noted auxiliary costs, which are charges for parking, dorms, etc, can vary dramatically between institutions and should be excluded.

Dr. McCurdy asked what everyone would like to see happen as a result of this Committee's work. For example, he would like to see a more systematic process of the legislature in determining the higher education budget.

*Agenda Item 4, Discussion of Organization of the Study Committee's Work:* Mr. Ravenel asked Dr. Garrison Walters to comment on the studies and describe suggestions relating to advisory groups. Dr. Walters agreed that the Foundations for the Future study was the strongest noting that the report provided a broader analysis for considering state needs while other reports moved more toward organization and accountability issues. He then presented ideas for a possible advisory group approach. (*See Agenda Item 4, Attachment, Discussion piece, Higher Education Study Committee Advisory Groups.*) Dr. Walters noted that the groups had been focused around short-term considerations that could be accomplished by the deadline for informing the budget process and longer-term statewide planning which may need to extend past the deadline to accomplish the necessary work. Dr. Walters suggested the New Carolina Competitiveness report be used as a springboard for planning and building linkages with the Committee's work. He recommended that Mr. George Fletcher be asked to address the Committee. The Committee agreed to invite Mr. Fletcher to speak at the next meeting.

Representative Govan commented on addressing long- and short-term issues and advocated for addressing what could be dealt with now and for using a retreat to assist in focusing the work.

Dr. Walters continued his explanation of the possible advisory group approach. Mr. Ravenel commented that he would like at least one or two Committee members to participate on the advisory groups with one serving as chair. General comments followed about various issues relating to the suggested advisory groups. Representative Govan brought up the issue of graduate retention in South Carolina. Dr. Helms stated that Mr. Bob Becker has that retention data. She stated that another interesting issue is whether out-of-state students stay in South Carolina after

they graduate. Mr. Ravenel commented that we also need to understand the state’s potential in providing jobs with appropriate income levels for these graduates.

Dr. Helms noted that there are three goals in Dr. Walters’ action plan. (*See Agenda, Item 3 “Action Planning for Higher Education in South Carolina: Ideas for a New Framework.”*) She suggested that each of the advisory groups address those goals.

Mr. Marlowe suggested that the Committee should follow the proviso and form six advisory groups (including scholarships and grants) to address each area listed. He stated that by doing so the committee will most directly answer the questions the legislature charged the committee to address. Dr. Helms stated that they still needed goals or aims to address as it would be unclear as to what the advisory groups would be responding to.

Representative Govan stated that there may be a large shortfall in next year’s budget. He added that the General Assembly recognizes that more money needs to go to higher education, but efforts must be organized and prioritized. He stated that the Committee should keep this report simple so that all of the state’s citizens can understand it. He advocated working with the proviso plan, combined with some of the legislative directives.

Mr. Marlowe agreed, stating that they should deliver the information back in the way in which it was presented by the legislature, making it clear and understandable.

Dr. Helms stated that if they used the proviso, the committee should still incorporate the three larger goals presented in Dr. Walters’ suggested Action Planning document.

The Committee then turned its focus to membership of the advisory groups. Mr. Ravenel commented that membership should be from a wide variety of knowledgeable persons. Mr. Ludlow commented that legislative staff could be invited to participate as well. The Committee proceeded to make assignments to advisory groups categorized on the basis of the proviso. The groupings and assignments indicated are listed in the table below.

1) Institutional Missions and Academic Programs and Planning	Helms, Eichelberger, Govan
2) Enrollment	McCurdy, Marlowe
3) Funding and Institutional Cost	Ludlow, Montgomery
4) Buildings, Facilities, and Information Technology	Montgomery, Ludlow, Eichelberger
5) Organization and Plan Implementation	Marlowe, Helms
6) Scholarships and Grants	Govan, Aiken

Mr. Ravenel stated that he and Dr. Walters will develop the goals between now and the next meeting. They will also contact Mr. Fletcher about speaking at the next meeting. Mr. Ravenel then asked Ms. Rogers to distribute travel claim forms to the members. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.