

**South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
Access & Equity Advisory Committee Quarterly Meeting
Department of Archives and History
June 23, 2005
10:30 a.m.**

Committee Members:

Ms. Sharon Bodrick
Mr. Keith Britton
Mr. James Carter
Ms. Precious Cristwell
Ms. Sharon Hanna
Dr. Mary Holloway
Ms. Sylvia Holmes
Ms. Croslena Johnson
Ms. Caren Kelley-Hall
Mr. Jerry Knighton
Ms. Mary Newton
Ms. Lottie Otto
Mr. Robert Pickering
Dr. Wilhelmenia Rembert
Ms. Lucille Skaggs
Dr. Jacqueline Skubal
Ms. Pat Singleton-Young
Mr. Carl Wells
Ms. Jewel Whitney
Ms. Monica Williams
Ms. Stacie Williams

Guests:

Dr. Chuck Lesser
Ms. Hope Rivers

Staff:

Mr. Michael Brown
Ms. Julie Carullo
Ms. Lorinda Copeland
Dr. Conrad Festa

1. **Introductions**

Mr. Michael Brown called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. Ms. Lorinda Copeland introduced everyone in attendance.

2. **Welcome**

Dr. Chuck Lesser, of the SC Archives and History, welcomed everyone and gave an overview of the programs and services offered by SC Archives and History. Dr. Conrad Festa also welcomed the group and thanked them for their work. Dr. Festa also offered encouragement and commended the group for looking at ways to document the progress they are making in their Access and Equity (A& E) programs. Dr. Festa stated he realizes a lot of the work can't be measured by numbers but that the General Assembly and other constituencies look for numbers. Dr. Festa encouraged them to do their best to document as much as they could in areas where it may be difficult.

3. **Approval of Minutes**

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the minutes as written.

4. **Legislative/Budget Update**

Ms. Julie Carullo, of the Commission on Higher Education, presented a legislative update and gave an overview of the Commission on Higher Education budget.

5. **Revised Measurable Goals Form**

Mr. Brown gave an overview of the budget report and stated there was time to make changes for the current year. One advisory committee member asked if the goal of the budget report was to address statewide or institutional needs. Mr. Brown responded that the report is for institutional needs. Mr. Brown also responded that he would prefer institutions collaborate and write proposals for a competitive grant for statewide projects versus individual statewide projects.

One advisory member questioned if the report was still a wish list of needs. Mr. Brown stated that the forms is a way to request funding needed by the institutions and is also a mechanism to request additional money needed. An advisory member commented that when an institution requests additional funds, the funds are distributed by formula to all institutions. Mr. Brown stated that additional funds will not be distributed based on current formula (allocated by headcount). Mr. Brown stated Dr. Festa wants additional funding to be used for competitive grants.

An advisory member suggested if an institution makes a request above their base allocation and the funding is received, the institution that requested the funding should receive it versus putting the money into a statewide competitive grant process. Mr. Brown responded that this could be done and that a competitive grant request section could be added on the form. This would result in two sources of competitive grant money. One source would be for statewide projects and the other source would be what each institution would like to receive through CHE's budget.

An advisory member stated his concern is whether needs are being received, if current levels of funding are being maintained, if funding is increasing, and that needs are being clearly communicated. Mr. Brown responded that one problem is that reporting is not in accordance with the guidelines. An advisory member suggested that everyone should be careful about directly relating dollars from CHE to outcomes because there are a number of factors that may contribute to the retention of students. Mr. Brown responded that his supervisors want programs that can be measured. If programs can't be measured, programs that can be measured should be implemented. If institutions want more money, a direct correlation must be shown. It was suggested that institutions use CHE money for scholarships and use institutional money for forums. Money used for programs with immeasurable goals can still be listed because often the money is used in conjunction with other money and this will show how access & equity money supports measurable outcomes. One advisory member suggested post-event surveys and a response was that surveys may not be reliable because they don't explain outcomes.

It was suggested that all programs and events should tie into overall institutional goals because Access & Equity programs should impact the institutional goals. A&E goals implemented should have the objective of getting institutions up to a statewide standard based on research results of problem areas in higher education. Instead of doing programs forever, once a goal is met A&E representatives should be challenged to do something else to meet the statewide needs that have been identified. Mr. Brown stated that A&E program goals and objectives can be incorporated with institutional goals which can be detailed on page 5 (program goal/objective) of the budget report.

Mr. Brown reported, as mentioned earlier, that Dr. Festa requested that additional money requested be set aside for competitive grants and that a competitive grant request section could be added to the report. The money received could be allocated to the institutions based on the percentage they requested. This would insure the institution received the proportion of what they requested. The other competitive grant process would be the A&E money CHE has set aside. It was suggested that parameters be established in requesting competitive grant money. It was suggested that it would be more appealing if the competitive grant was a dollar amount versus a percentage. Mr. Brown questioned how he would present this request to the Commission since this would be an additional competitive grant request. It was suggested that competitive requests be submitted as part of an overall request. It was decided that the budget form didn't need any additions because the money received over and beyond the base will be allocated based on what the institution requested.

Mr. Brown stated that the budget report forms can capture what is needed. It was suggested that an additional line be added to the first page so that the need (student support, recruitment, retention, etc.) that is being addressed is reflected. It was also suggested that examples of acceptable programs be given.

6. Discussion of Vision/Mission of A & E 2006 and Beyond

Mr. Brown stated that re-evaluation of A&E programs on campuses and funding categories was discussed during the review of the Measurable Goals form. See Agenda Item 5. He stated that institutional collaboration could be accomplished through the process of competitive grants. Mr. Brown stated that the competitive grant criteria could be revised however he suggests the \$40,000 competitive grant money be used for institutional collaboration and/or K-12 initiatives.

7. Discussion of Next Year's SC-PAAE/Access and Equity Conference

Mr. Brown reported that although the A & E conference was outstanding the Commission's concern was that information was disseminated late and felt that participation would have been greater if information was received earlier. Mr. Keith Britton responded that they would work to find the ideal time to disseminate information. They do not want to disseminate conference information so early that people will put it aside and forget. Mr. Britton emphasized that it is important to at least get the dates out because professional development requests are often made in advance.

Mr. Britton also reported that the conference will be held in Charleston next year. An advisory committee member reminded the committee that she had suggested that students who have benefited from A&E should be invited to the conference to showcase their success stories. It was suggested that when reporting is done, these successful students are mentioned and that a documentary be produced on the successful students and this documentary can be used to sell legislators.

8. Other Business

No additional business was discussed.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorinda Copeland
Recording Secretary