

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Meeting held at
1122 Lady Street, Suite 300
Columbia, S.C. 29201
12:00 p.m.

Minutes of the Meeting
October 5, 2017

Commissioners Attending

Mr. Tim Hofferth, Chair (phone)	Dr. Bettie Rose Horne	Mr. Kim Phillips
Ms. Dianne Kuhl, Vice Chair	Mr. Kenneth Kirkland	Ms. Terry Seckinger
Mr. Paul Batson	Ms. Allison Dean Love	
Mr. Devron Edwards (phone)	Dr. Louis Lynn (phone)	
	Mr. Charles Munns (phone)	

Commission Members Absent

Mr. Richard Jones (excused)

Guests Attending

Ms. Beth Bell, Clemson University	Dr. Suzanne Ozment, Lander University
Dr. Connie Book, The Citadel	Ms. Michelle Paczynski, S.C. Department of Employee and Workforce
Dr. Lynn Cherry, College of Charleston	Dr. Faith Polkei, A.T. Still University
Mr. Cardon Crawford, The Citadel	Dr. Hope Rivers, S.C. Technical College System
Mr. Tim Drueke, Winthrop University	Mr. Edward Shannon, S.C. Independent Colleges and Universities
Mr. Jane Johansen, Coastal Carolina University	Dr. Ted Wendell, A.T. Still University
Mr. Rick Kelly, University of South Carolina Columbia	Dr. Ruth Wittman-Price, Francis Marion University
Dr. Christopher Kennedy, Francis Marion University	Ms. Helen Zeigler, University of South Carolina Columbia
Dr. Peter King, Francis Marion University	
Mr. A.J. Newton, House Ways and Means	

Commission Staff Present

Mr. Jeff Schilz	Ms. Trena Houpp
Dr. Argentini Anderson	Ms. Elizabeth Jablonski
Mr. Clay Barton	Dr. John Lane
Ms. Laura Belcher	Ms. Katie Philpott
Ms. Carrie Bundrick	Dr. Regine Rucker
Ms. Saundra Carr	Mr. Keeran Sittampalam
Ms. Lane Goodwin	Dr. Kimberly Walker
Ms. Anna Grubic	Dr. Karen Woodfaulk
Dr. Falcia Harvey	

Vice Chair Kuhl convened the meeting at 12:05 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance. It was confirmed that the meeting was being held in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act

1. Introductions

Elizabeth Jablonski

Ms. Jablonski introduced the guests in attendance.

2. Approval of Minutes

Dianne Kuhl

A **motion** was made (Seckinger), **seconded** (Phillips), and **carried** to approve the minutes of the September 7, 2017 CHE meeting. A **motion** was made (Horne), **seconded** (Seckinger), and **carried** to go into Executive Session at 12:08 p.m. for the purpose of discussing legal and personnel matters. No motion resulted from Executive Session. At 1:03 p.m., the meeting returned to regular business. Vice Chair Kuhl moved that due to time constraints, the agenda be re-ordered to ensure action items are considered. Commissioner Kirkland seconded and all voted in favor of the motion.

3. Presentation on S.C. Department of Employee and Workforce and S.C. Commission On Higher Education Career Pathways Initiative

Michelle Paczynski and Regine Rucker

Interim President and Executive Director Schilz introduced Michelle Paczynski and Regine Rucker who presented information on a new initiative, Career Pathways [see Attachment 1]. Ms. Paczynski explained the initiative is an example of collaboration between education and workforce and was created in response to the concept being included in the strategic plan of the S.C. Department of Workforce and Development and in response to House Bill 3220, which re-established the Education and Economic Development Council. Dr. Rucker clarified that the initiative is still being developed and then she defined career pathways are a sequence of stackable credits and credentials combined with support services that provide students and job seekers with the skills and knowledge required to advance their education as well as being employed in high-demand occupations. She informed the Commission that the entities involved are consulting similar programs in other states.

4. Chairman’s Report

Dianne Kuhl

Vice Chair Kuhl stated that there was no Chairman’s Report

5. Vice Chair’s Report

Dianne Kuhl

Vice Chair Kuhl stated she had no report.

6. Interim President and Executive Director’s Report

Jeff Schilz

Consideration of the Public Agenda

Interim President and Executive Director Jeff Schilz presented the Public Agenda for approval, outlining successes gained since the 2009 Higher Education Action Plan, remaining challenges, goals and initiatives. He explained that the Commission began work on the development of the Agenda a year and a half ago and has worked with other state agencies and stakeholders throughout the process. He clarified that the initiatives are at different stages of development and implementation, with some initiatives still in the conception phase. He emphasized the need for CHE and the higher education community to collaborate and build upon the goals and initiatives of the Pre-Kindergarten to 12 (PK-12) agencies as well as the workforce agencies in the state. Through the presentation, Mr. Schilz described the talent pipeline and explained the critical role higher education plays in bridging the PK-12 sector to a skilled and employed workforce.

The Commissioners discussed at length certain elements of the agenda and expressed a few concerns. Commissioner Batson thanked Mr. Schilz and other staff members for their hard work on creating concise goals. He expressed general support for the SCCORE initiative but then asked about the governance of the program. Mr. Schilz thanked Commissioner Batson for his support; re-iterated the initiative is still in development and explained institutions will administer the courses but CHE will serve as a reference

point, providing information on the courses offered. Commissioner Batson stated the S.C. Technical College System already administers general education courses that are transferable and offers 2,600 courses online. He then asked about logistical planning of the program, including the use of LTAP funds. Mr. Schilz responded that the program is still being explored and developed. Commissioner Batson suggested the possibility of taking the SCCORE initiative out of the Public Agenda and then work on it as a separate project.

Commissioner Munns expressed his general support for the agenda and then presented three discussion points/questions. He asked about how the goals were defined, the metrics that will be used to measure success, and the development of a public relations/marketing plan. He expressed concern about including the SCCORE slide as it currently stands because there are still many unknowns about the initiative. He suggested that the slide be revised to indicate general goals in the subject area with potential avenues to pursue those goals, leaving out the details such as pricing.

Commissioner Seckinger referred to the *Annual Report on the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (NC-SARA) and South Carolina Activities*, which will be presented for information during the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL) report. She commented on the number of South Carolina students who are taking online courses outside the state (over 29,000) and stated that a program like SCCORE could potentially help retain students in-state. She expressed support for SCCORE while also acknowledging that details will need to continue to be finalized.

Vice Chair Kuhl remarked that she wanted all Commissioners to have the opportunity to speak on the subject of the Public Agenda but asked them to keep their comments brief. Commissioner Love thanked Mr. Schilz and staff members for their hard work on the development of the Public Agenda. She agreed with Commissioner Batson about removing SCCORE from the Public Agenda for today's consideration and suggested the possibility of re-visiting the initiative in November. She stated that she is not opposed to the concept of the initiative but wants to take more time to clarify the details of the program and answer the questions of Commissioners and institutional representatives. Given limited time, she asked that her full comments be included in the meeting minutes [see Attachment 2].

Commissioner Kirkland expressed his support for the SCCORE initiative, agreeing with Commissioner Seckinger about potentially retaining the 29,000 South Carolina residents who are currently taking online courses from institutions outside the state. He stated that he agrees with it being included in the Public Agenda consideration.

Commissioner Lynn expressed his concern about the SCCORE initiative and stated that it might be best to take it out of the Public Agenda for this meeting's consideration. Commissioner Munns agreed with Commissioner Lynn and suggested that the slide be revised as stated earlier. Commissioner Edwards expressed his appreciation for the discussion and all positions presented on the issue. He then stated his support for SCCORE because he believes that it will help more South Carolinians afford a higher education. Commissioner Horne commented on her support of the Public Agenda and for the concept of SCCORE but recognized the need for finalization of details. She agreed with Commissioner Munns that the slide could be revised. Vice Chair Kuhl commented that revising the slide is a good option. Commissioner Lynn suggested revising the slide by removing the price point and inserting specific language related to core courses. Commissioner Phillips responded that he agreed with Commissioner Lynn about inserting language about core courses but supports leaving the price point. He then asked Commissioner Lynn about his concerns. Commissioner Lynn and Commissioner Munns commented that CHE does not have the authority to set tuition, only institutional Boards have that authority. Vice Chair Kuhl responded that her understanding is that institutional participation in the SCCORE initiative would be voluntary and that the \$175/credit hour has not been finalized.

Chair Hofferth expressed his support for the Public Agenda and thanked the Commissioners for their robust discussion. He reiterated that the Public Agenda is not a mandate document and that details around the initiatives are in different stages of development. He expressed his specific support for SCCORE. He stated that he has accompanied Mr. Schilz on several meetings with institutional presidents who responded positively to the initiative. He explained that business and legislative representatives have responded positively as well. Chair Hofferth commented that the framework of the initiative is good and that additional meetings regarding the details can be planned. He stated that the initiative would help more South Carolinians afford higher education, while also recognizing that the price point is only a proposed rate.

Commissioner Batson commented that questions still remain about SCCORE and he suggested sending the initiative to one of the committees for further review and planning.

Commissioner Love commented that the CHE By-Laws state that items need to be submitted 48 hours in advance of consideration. Vice Chair Kuhl responded that the rule does not apply. Commissioner Love asked for the reasoning and Vice Chair Kuhl stated that the rule was discussed in Executive Session and that according to counsel, the 48-hour rule did not apply to this item. Commissioner Love also stated that the Public Agenda was not reviewed in its final form by the Special Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Public Agenda.

Vice Chair Kuhl expressed her support for the Public Agenda and for the SCCORE initiative, adding that making higher education more affordable will help South Carolina move forward. She commented the Public Agenda, including the SCCORE initiative, has been presented to many stakeholders, including other state agencies, and feedback has been incorporated.

A **motion** was made (Phillips) and **seconded** (Seckinger) to approve the Public Agenda with the one edit to add the word “core” to Slide 18 to describe the courses that will be offered through the SCCORE initiative. Commissioner Batson asked whether he could offer an amendment to the motion to refer the development of SCCORE to a committee for further development. Commissioner Lynn seconded the amendment. Commissioners discussed the next action according to procedure. Commissioner Phillips commented that he does not think the initiative should be referred back to Committee and then asked for the reasoning for the initiative to be referred to committee. Commissioner Batson responded that the committee could further develop the initiative and bring it back to the Commission with the details in place. Commissioner Kirkland stated that the initiative should not be referred to a committee, but should be considered by the full body to which it was presented. Commissioner Batson and Horne commented that the final approval would be made by the full Commission after committee consideration. Chair Hofferth commented that Mr. Schilz advanced a proposal in the way of a Public Agenda; a motion was presented and seconded; and a vote should be taken. He reiterated that the document is a “living” document and can continued to be discussed.

Vice Chair Kuhl decided to call for a vote on the motion based on the understanding of Robert’s Rules as discussed in the meeting. She also stated if a Commissioner wanted to make an additional motion after the vote, that motion would be considered then. Vice Chair Kuhl asked for a vote on the motion and it **carried** with a vote of eight to three (with Hofferth, Kuhl, Batson, Edwards, Horne, Kirkland, Phillips, and Seckinger voting in favor; Munns, Lynn, and Love voting against; and Jones not present for the vote).

A **motion** was made (Batson) and **seconded** (Love) that the SCCORE initiative be referred to the appropriate standing or new committee, to be determined by the Chair, for development and refinement of the details. Vice Chair Kuhl asked for a vote on the motion and it **carried** with a vote of six to five (with Munns, Lynn, Horne, Batson, Edwards and Love voting in favor; Kuhl, Kirkland, Hofferth, Seckinger, and Phillips voting against; and Jones not present for the vote).

7. Committee Reports

7.01 Report of the Executive Committee

Dianne Kuhl

The committee had no report.

7.02 Report of Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing

Terrye Seckinger

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Program Proposal

Francis Marion University, Doctor of Nursing Practice (D.N.P.), with 1) Practitioner track (BSN to DNP) and 2) Practitioner track (MSN to DNP)

B. Application for Initial License

A.T. Still University, D.O. (Doctor Osteopathic Medicine), establish a branch in Ridgeland, SC

C. Awards for *EIA Centers of (Teacher Education) Excellence Competitive Grants Program, FY 2017-18* (For information, no action required)

D. *Annual Report on Staff-Approved Mission Statement Modifications, FY2016-17* (For information, no action required)

E. *Annual Report on Terminated and Approved Programs, FY 2016-17* (For information, no action required)

F. *Annual Report on Licensing Activities, FY 2016-17* (For information, no action required)

G. *Annual Report on the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (NC-SARA) and South Carolina Activities* (For information, no action required)

H. *Report on Program Modifications, May 1-August 31, 2017* (For information, no action required)

Commissioner Seckinger presented the two items under the Consent Agenda. She explained that the proposal for a Doctor of Nursing Practice (D.N.P.) from Francis Marion is a professional practice doctorate and the graduates will be able to serve the medically-underserved region of the PeeDee. She presented the application for initial licensure for A.T. Still University to establish a branch in Ridgeway to offer a D.O. (Doctor Osteopathic Medicine) degree, explaining that Beaufort-Jasper-Hampton Health Services have served as a clinical site for the doctorate but now will be a branch campus. She reiterated the region is medically underserved.

The consent agenda, which was brought forward as a motion from the committee and therefore did not require a second, **passed** unanimously.

After the Commission considered the remaining action items on the agenda, Commissioner Seckinger presented Agenda Items 7.02 C-H as informational items.

7.03 Report of Committee on Access & Equity and Student Services

Paul Batson

Commissioner Batson stated that the Committee had no report.

7.04 Report of Committee on Finance and Facilities

Dianne Kuhl

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Interim Capital Projects

1. The Citadel
 - Academic Building Replacement (Capers Hall)
 - Revise Scope and Increase Phase I Budget
2. Medical University of South Carolina
 - a. Basic Science Building 7th Floor Biorepository & Histology Lab Renovations
 - Establish Construction Budget
 - b. Clinical Sciences Building Cooling Towers Replacement
 - Establish Construction Budget
 - c. Clinical Sciences Building 8th Floor Northwest Side Renovation
 - Establish Construction Budget
 - d. Thurmond Gazes Building 6th Floor Alcohol Research Center Renovations
 - Establish Construction Budget
 - e. Basic Science Building Exterior Envelope Repairs
 - Establish Project
 - f. Storm Eye Institute Chiller Replacement
 - Establish Project
3. Coastal Carolina University
 - a. Ingle Residence Hall Renovation
 - Establish Construction Budget
 - b. Williams Brice Renovation and Repair
 - Establish Project

B. Lease Approval

1. University of South Carolina
 - Campus Village Housing Development

B. Other Business

1. Staff Approvals for September 2017 (*For Information, No Action Required*)
2. Other Business

Vice Chair Kuhl informed the Commission that Agenda Item 7.04 B, Lease Approval for USC’s Campus Village Housing Development would be pulled from the consent agenda and considered separately. Commissioners voted unanimously to pull the item off the consent agenda. Vice Chair Kuhl then briefly explained the interim capital projects on the consent agenda. The consent agenda, which was brought forward as a motion from the committee and therefore did not require a second, **passed** unanimously. Vice Chair Kuhl presented and briefly explained USC’s Lease Approval for the Campus Village Housing Development, stating the cost of \$450 million and highlighting the complexity of the proposal. She explained, to her knowledge, CHE has never considered a proposal of this magnitude and complexity. She continued by stating that due to lack of consideration time and limited analysis resources to complete a

thorough review, the Committee voted to send the proposal forward to the Joint Bond Review Committee (JBRC) with neither a positive nor a negative recommendation and to request that Mr. Schilz send a letter to JBRC explaining the Commission's decision. The item, which was brought forward as a motion from the committee and therefore did not require a second, **passed** unanimously.

Vice Chair Kuhl referred to the additional item for information and gave an update as to the process by which staff and the Committee will present the Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plan (CPIP) information.

7.05 Report of Special Ad Hoc Subcommittee—Boards of Trustees Code of Conduct **Ken Kirkland**

Commissioner Kirkland reported the Committee is awaiting more information from the State Inspector General's office.

7.06 Report of Special Ad Hoc Subcommittee—Public Agenda **Allison Dean Love**

Commissioner Love re-stated Commissioner Munns' question from earlier about the marketing plan for the Public Agenda. Mr. Schilz responded that a marketing plan will be created. Commissioner Munns asked that an update be given at the next meeting as to the planning for the measurement of Public Agenda goals.

8. Other Business

Commissioner Horne shared with the Commission information about a recent United Way publication entitled "Self-Sufficiency Standard for South Carolina." She also reported that Greenwood County, through the *Greenwood Promise*, has raised its college-going rate by 39%.

9. Public Comment

There was no public comment provided.

10. End of Business Meeting

A **motion** was made, **seconded**, and **carried** to adjourn the meeting at 2:56 p.m.

South Carolina Career Pathways

Michelle Paczynski, Deputy Assistant Executive Director
Department of Employment and Workforce (DEW)
Email: mpaczynski@dew.sc.gov

Regine Rucker, Ph.D., Program Manager
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE)
Email: rrucker@che.sc.gov

Career Pathways

- Offer a sequence of stackable credits and credentials, combined with support services.
- Provide students and job seekers with the knowledge and skills required to advance their education and become employed in high-demand occupations.
- Nationally, efforts are underway. Some states have operational career pathways, while others are making progress on specific elements (CO, KY, KS, and TN).

Comments from Commissioner Love

As the Chair of the Public Agenda Ad Hoc Committee, I want to speak for all our committee members in thanking Jeff Schilz, Dr. John Lane, Dr. Karen Woodfaulk and their staff, in particular Dr. Anderson, Dr. Harvey, Dr. Rucker, Dr. Walker, Trena Houp and Dr. Erica Von Nessen for their amazing work on the public agenda over the past several months.

I also want to thank Melanie Barton from the SC Education Oversight Committee, Molly Spearman from the SC Department of Education, Cheryl Stanton and Michelle from the SC Department of Employment and Workforce, Elisabeth Kovacs from the SC Department of Commerce, Ted Pitts from the SC Chamber of Commerce, the State Workforce Development Board, the Technical College Presidents, the Comprehensive and Research College Presidents and for all the commissioners who participated in these meetings for their time and efforts in our meetings. It is for the good of our students and for them that we at CHE act as a liaison in getting more students through the pipeline and educates in the right way to have a vibrant economy in South Carolina.

This is a truly incredible document with great strategies and goals. I am very excited and enthusiastic and want to re-affirm my support. In order for South Carolina to move forward and meet the needs of our community with regards to workforce development and our economy.

Last fall I in discussing our vision at one of our committee meetings, we said that our vision was that this public agenda is one of the most important things we can do for the state of South Carolina and its citizens, taxpayers, students and colleges. I also said that collaboration and being on the same page are key. The purpose is for economic development, jobs and quality of life.

I am most excited about our educational attainment goal of 60%, and that means certificates, 2-year associate's degrees and 4-year degrees as well.

I regret our ad hoc committee was unable to reach a quorum to meet to discuss the information prior to today's meeting. I received comments from some of you and, in particular, college Presidents whose colleges I represent.

Tim is always saying "Where you stand depends on where you sit" and I was appointed by the previous Governor to represent the four-year colleges. I want to ensure I give voice to some concerns and reservations they have about one particular piece of the public agenda. As a collaborator and communicator, I make decisions based on a lot of research, data and gathering information of all kinds. After all, this is the SC Commission on Higher Education and we need to listen to higher education.

During the Presidents Council meeting last Wednesday afternoon we heard some concerns voiced about the SCCORE portion of the public agenda, which I did not realize was going to be included in the public agenda until after the meeting. Since that time, I have heard from eight college Presidents or other senior staff who questioned the program.

Also, Admiral Munns, a member of the Public Agenda Ad Hoc Committee, sent me very thoughtful and warrants serious consideration:

“We should not include this idea in the public agenda at this point. 1) it seems controversial, is not yet coordinated across Higher Ed, and may drag down the whole agenda effort 2) SCCORE seems to me a program proposal, and as such we should follow our procedures by writing up a proposal, get ACAP approval, CAAL consideration and then CHE approval as a stand-alone initiative. Not sure how we would defend not following our own procedures. “

This does not mean that SCCORE is not a good program because it is a concept which has good merit and it may be prove to be a perfectly good program with further study, but as a collaborator and with a collaborative spirit I had to ensure we are listening to all our constituent groups and that I properly give voice to the reservations I’ve heard from my committee members on the Commission and from the colleges.

I do not want to see an otherwise wonderful public agenda have any lack of enthusiasm or misunderstanding, so with that I would like to propose an amendment to the motion:

Approve the public agenda without SCCORE.

As Admiral Munns said, SCCORE seems to be a program proposal, and as such we should follow our procedures by writing up a proposal, get ACAP approval, CAAL consideration and then CHE approval as a stand-alone initiative.

Commissioners Seckinger and Horne also heard the conversation last week, so I’d ask them to weigh in, as well as Admiral Munns, Paul Batson and anyone else.

Palmetto College seems to be set up for a similar purpose?

Would students be eligible for state money?

We need to ensure our stakeholders are all on board and understand how it works.

Amendment to continue the public agenda ad hoc committee to review other states, data and come up with a recommendation?

Add a minority report to include these and other comments in the minutes

I want to support it, but don’t feel like I have enough information. With more communication, we might be able to get there. I just don’t think we are in agreement on that one issue. Otherwise, it is an amazing document and, once again, I give my thanks and praise to everyone who worked so hard to make it work.

I understand we aren’t pushing a button to turn it on tomorrow, but I am afraid we have gotten the cart in front of the horse....