

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

APRIL 24, 1987

USC-BEAUFORT

Informal Session

Chairman Powers called the meeting to order.

Dean Tuttle (Beaufort) welcomed everyone to "beautiful Beaufort-by-the-sea." He invited members of the body to tour the old elementary school after lunch. The building was recently acquired by USC-Beaufort and plans are being made to renovate it. He also thanked the individuals who made arrangements and prepared food for the Senate meeting.

Dean Arnold (Lancaster) thanked the folks at the Beaufort Campus for their hospitality. He stated that USC-Lancaster was having a good spring semester with a surprisingly good enrollment and a number of activities and events such as local and state history days, a science fair, and a system meeting of registrars.

Dean May (Lifelong Learning) reported that enrollments had risen by 8% in 1986-87 and he added that non-credit activities have also increased. "All in all," he said, "Lifelong Learning has had a very good year."

Dean Clayton (Salkehatchie) and Dean Anderson (Sumter) were not present and there was no report from either campus.

Dean Davis (Union) said he was pleased to be in Beaufort, and he commented on a number of developments at the Union Campus. The gymnasium, now referred to as an activity center, has a new basketball arena, and the building also houses the student activities coordinator and the Student Government Association. Renovation of the Central Building is nearing the final phase, and a request for funds to renovate the main building has been formulated. A Title III grant proposal is in the formative stages. If it is approved, grants could account for nearly half of the USC-Union budget. The grant is being eagerly pursued because it offers possibilities for faculty development as well as student development activities. A coordinator for recruitment and retention has recently been hired, and there is optimism that this individual will be able to help effect enrollment gains for the Campus. Awards Day activities on April 23 included a talk by Gayle Sayers, a luncheon, an ice cream social attended by members of the community, and a country concert. Dean Davis said he was pleased with developments this spring, and he is reasonably optimistic regarding future enrollments.

The Chair introduced Jim Morris from the Computer Services Division for a special presentation. Mr. Morris reported that the University has new contracts with IBM, Zenith, NCR, and Apple, and the Computer Services Division is now a direct dealer for Apple.

Faculty, staff, and students may make purchases under these agreements, and price lists are available by calling 777-4409. The University is switching from AT&T to Southern Net for its telephone service, and rates for the University Campuses will probably be reduced by 18 to 35%. Mr. Morris introduced Jane Terpstra, also employed by CSD, to talk about a new service for faculty.

Ms. Terpstra mentioned that a flier had been sent to each faculty member introducing the new service, which provides free assistance to those wishing to design their own computer-based or interactive videodisc lessons. Interested faculty members should write a letter requesting assistance. A booklet is available which describes the service and provides guidelines for applying, and three seminars have been scheduled to aid applicants. The first two (May 22 and June 5) deal with computer-based instruction--the first for those who have little background; the second for persons with some knowledge of computers who want to learn more about the characteristics of effective computer-based instruction and its use in research. The third seminar (June 12) covers the use of interactive videodiscs--a new technology combining video images with the computer. Ms. Terpstra said she had some copies of guideline booklets and seminar announcements with her, and she encouraged those in attendance to apply for the service and speak with others on their local campus about it.

Jim Morris stated that money is not yet available for the faculty training seminars discussed last year, and therefore the above-mentioned seminars are offered free of charge to three faculty members from each of the University Campuses. He added that more individuals could attend if space permits.

Chairman Powers asked members of the Executive Committee to take a copy of the information made available by Ms. Terpstra for use by local campus faculty. He then requested a report from the Nominating Committee.

Vice Chairman Willis, chairman of the Nominating Committee, presented nominees for Senate offices and Special Committees for the 1987-88 academic year. He reminded the group that the positions of Chair and Immediate Past Chair of the Senate are filled by automatic succession, and therefore there is no vote for those offices. In addition, University Campuses representatives to the System Committee and the Academic Planning Committee (both Special Committees) are not to be elected by the Senate. The Chairperson of the Senate is customarily chosen by President Holderman to sit on the former, and the representative to the latter committee will be continuing a three-year term.

Nominees were asked to stand, and the Chair reminded Senators that these were recommendations only. He opened the floor for further nominations, and there were none. Chairman Powers stated that additional nominations could be made during the afternoon session.

The Chair asked if there were concerns or reports which needed the attention of the body, and none were brought forward. He mentioned

that copies of Professor Gardner's report had been received, and that additional copies of Dr. Duffy's report and the minutes of the February 13 Faculty Senate meeting were available. Chairman Powers reminded senators that they should identify themselves and speak up when addressing the assembly, and that all motions and resolutions must be presented in writing to the Secretary.

Rod Sproatt (Beaufort) reviewed room assignments for committee meetings and provided instructions for those needing to make copies.

There being no other matters needing attention, Chairman Powers adjourned the informal session of the Senate.

### GENERAL SESSION

#### I. Call to Order

Chairman Powers called the afternoon session to order.

#### II. Correction/Approval of Minutes

The Chair asked members of the body if there were corrections or additions to the minutes of the February 13, 1987 meeting of the Senate. Hearing no response, he noted that on the first line of page 8, "Rights and Responsibilities Committee" should be replaced by "Executive Committee". There were no other changes, and the minutes were approved as corrected.

#### III. Reports from University Officers.

##### A. Dr. John J. Duffy, System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education (see Attachment 1)

The Vice President reported that there have been no noteworthy changes in the budget recently. He commended Linda Allman, the Library Processing Center staff, and all campus Librarians (including those on Four-Year Campuses) for taking a leadership role in the RECON project. Dr. Duffy called attention to the Adult Learner Conference, saying that interested persons should contact their local dean. He commented on the Beaufort marketing study and the fact that many people in the community do not know "what we're about or who we are". The Vice President remarked that we are highly thought of by those who are aware of the University Campuses. This recognition problem is something he feels will have to be worked on, and he thinks faculty should play a major role. On faculty salaries, Dr. Duffy stated his feeling that the efforts of his Office and the Deans of the University Campuses have been rewarded. There has been a change in peer institutions which are used for salary comparisons, which has resulted in extra money in the budget. It is hoped that we will soon be close to obtaining formula funding, and that the administration will be able to do more to enhance University Campuses faculty salaries than those of state employees in

general. Dr. Duffy stated his intention to seek approval of the CHE for the operations at Walterboro, Laurens, and Hilton Head, to "bring them in out of the cold". The reasons for doing this are 1) the Commission will probably change its own regulations and require it within a few months, and 2) it is required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and therefore "absolutely essential" to our accreditation. He thinks employees on the affected campuses will be involved in this process.

On the personal side, the Vice President expressed his thanks for the birthday party given him at lunch. He said he could not think of a better group of people to be with on his birthday.

B. Professor John N. Gardner, Associate Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education

The Associate Vice President stated he wished to add to his written report (Attachment 2). He commented on an action taken by the University System Financial Aid and Scholarship Committee, a group that establishes systemwide policy regarding the distribution of award criteria for scholarships. One award affecting dependents of University Campuses employees is the Faculty/Staff Dependent Scholarship Program, sponsored by the USC Educational Foundation. As more of us have college-aged children, the demand for funds under this program is increasing more rapidly than the available money. As a result, it is not possible to award all applicants the same amount given in previous years. This year, for instance, the award is \$850 for all applicants regardless of the campus on which they study. The Committee has decided to recommend that all eligible dependents (those with a predicted 3.0 GPR who meet other criteria for the scholarship) be awarded an equal percentage of their tuition costs. This year, \$850 is 42% of the tuition costs at USC-Columbia. On the same scale, students on Four-Year Campuses would receive \$600 and those on University Campuses would be awarded \$500. Those are the figures being recommended to the Foundation for next year. The Associate Vice President also related a development concerning the relationship between University Campuses and the State's technical education centers. Midlands Technical College proposed to offer three new programs at Fort Jackson, one of which was an Associate in Arts, a degree which appeared to be "directly duplicatory and in conflict with" a program that USC has been offering for military personnel for about two decades. The administration decided to object to the Midlands Tech proposal "professionally, quietly, and politely", with the promise that objections would be expressed in a more public fashion if people in the TEC System did not cooperate. As a result of concerns raised by the University, the State Technical Board and Midlands Technical College decided to withdraw the proposal for the conflicting program.

The Chair announced that under the authority granted him at the last meeting of the Senate (University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, February 13, 1987, page 9), he asked Bill Bowers (Salkehatchie) to substitute for Bob Group as a representative to the Academic Planning Committee. The substitution was a temporary move necessitated by a scheduling conflict.

#### IV. Reports from Standing Committees

##### A. Rights and Responsibilities--Professor John Logue (Sumter)

Chairman Powers requested that the report of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee be postponed pending the return of Rod Sproatt (Beaufort). Professor Sproatt authored a proposal concerning the organization and procedures of the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee, and those issues were to be considered in the report of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee. There were no objections to the postponement.

##### B. Welfare--Professor Don Curlovic (Sumter)

Professor Curlovic announced that he had been reelected Chairman of the Welfare Committee for 1987-88. He introduced the following motion from the Committee:

WHEREAS all employees with faculty rank have been declared to be full-time faculty, and

WHEREAS all employees with faculty rank are treated as unclassified for purposes of salary increases, and

WHEREAS not all eleven and twelve month faculty have been included in past salary studies, and

WHEREAS past salary studies have not allowed an individual faculty member to compare her/his salary and salary increase with those of other faculty, and

WHEREAS past salary studies have not indicated what portion of the salary increase is for merit and what portion is for low-end adjustment, and

WHEREAS the Welfare Committee is recommending that all faculty who perform their assigned duties satisfactorily be given a merit increase which as a minimum equals the percentage raise given to all classified state employees, and

WHEREAS comparing nine month and eleven/twelve month salaries using a factor of nine-elevenths is misleading, and

WHEREAS the state legislature has been considering bills for more freedom of information on salaries of state employees, and

WHEREAS rumors of salary inequities tend to create morale problems and a listing could show that no such inequities exist, and

WHEREAS a listing of salaries without names would not allow an individual's salary to be identified;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT as a part of the 1987-88 salary report, each campus give a list (without names) of all salaries of employees with faculty rank (excluding the Dean of the University Campus). This list would be divided into two parts, one with those faculty with eleven/twelve month contracts and the other with those faculty with nine month contracts. Each part would contain the following information on each individual salary;

- 1) 1986-87 salary
- 2) the amount of raise based on the percentage increase given to each faculty member who performed her/his assigned duties satisfactorily
- 3) additional merit pay
- 4) amount of low-end adjustment

A suggested format for the two parts of this report (to be completed by each campus) is attached (Attachment 3).

The Chair stated that the motion, coming from Committee, needed no second. He opened the floor for discussion and asked Professor Curlovic to speak first.

Senator Curlovic responded that he felt the motion was self-explanatory, and mentioned that it constituted only part of this year's salary study--the Committee will be requesting other information as well. He volunteered to answer questions on the motion.

Vice President Duffy commented that the General Assembly was considering legislation which would legalize the revelation of individual faculty salaries. Under the proposed law, precise figures could be released for faculty who make more than \$50,000 annually, while salaries of employees earning between \$30,000 and \$50,000 could be disclosed within a range of \$4,000. He said the faculty salaries which are reported are generally nine month salaries. However state agencies, which are looking more closely at our situation

than they have in the past, are aware that most faculty are paid more than that when overloads and summer teaching are considered. For instance, Dr. Duffy observed that faculty members could be making \$28,000 on a nine-month basis but more than \$30,000 annually. He promised that, within the limits of whatever law is in effect, faculty on the University Campuses will be given the most complete salary information possible. He added that he had no problem with the release of salaries, and if he had anything to do with it, all salaries would be publicized immediately. Professor Gardner concurred.

Professor Curlovic replied that the Committee considered the proposed legislation, and the \$4,000 range for salaries of \$50,000 or less was deemed unsatisfactory--precise dollar amounts are desired.

The Vice President reiterated that if the decision were his, the desired information would be made available. Within the boundaries prescribed by statutes and University policy, he will provide all possible data. He stated that as far as he is concerned "full disclosure...is the only way to go."

Senator Curlovic said his understanding was that the Welfare Committee will receive what it is requesting if the release of such information is permissible.

Professor Gardner added that the Committee could not receive data if its release is not allowed by state law or by University policy. He reminded the body that University Campuses Faculty have been given more salary information than faculty on any other USC campuses. The administration has provided us with all data permitted by statutes and University policy, and the Associate Vice President promised "that's what we'll do in the future."

Professor Curlovic mentioned that the Welfare Committee had not previously asked for the specific salary information requested in the motion under discussion. The Committee understands that current law does not prohibit the publication of such information.

Professor Gardner said that it would be illegal to release information in such a way that individual identities could be revealed. Such revelations are a potential problem on small campuses. To protect identities and avoid violations of state policy and statute, salaries of eleven and twelve month employees have been converted to a nine month basis. The release of the information requested by the Welfare Committee would violate the current statute, and therefore it cannot be done.

Senator Dockery (Lifelong Learning) asked whether it would violate the law if a formal release were signed by individuals allowing their salaries to be published. Dr. Duffy said his understanding was that such an action would be legal, citing the example of deans who have released their salaries.

Senator Curlovic stated he had been informed that studies conducted some years ago included the names and salaries of individual faculty members. The Vice President responded that as far as he knew, such information was not provided in the past. He added that data generated for the Welfare Committee's annual salary studies have been used by the administration to successfully argue for a change in peer institutions, thereby strengthening the argument for increasing the salaries of our faculty.

Senator Dockery stated that Dr. Milton Baker is currently working on updated salary statistics based on a comparison with a recent article in The Chronicle of Higher Education. Those data will probably be obtained during the next couple of months.

Chairman Powers asked for further discussion, and then called the question on the Welfare Committee motion, which was approved.

Senator Curlovic mentioned that the 1987-88 salary study would not include a list of questions for the University Campuses Deans. The only information requested of the Deans is the data on individual salaries called for in the motion just passed by the Senate.

Professor Curlovic, on behalf of the Welfare Committee, moved the adoption of the following recommendations concerning 1987-88 faculty salaries:

- 1) A listing of all faculty salaries on each campus should be provided to the Welfare Committee. (See previous motion.)
- 2) A substantial part of the money available for merit increases should be used to give an across-the-board percentage merit raise for all faculty performing their assigned duties satisfactorily. As a minimum, this percentage increase should be equal to the percentage increase that is given to all classified state employees.

Additional merit should be awarded on the basis of outstanding contribution to the institution, and should only be awarded in cases in which a person has clearly contributed beyond what most faculty have done.



- 3) The salary study that has been generated in the past should be continued for the academic year 1987-88.
- 4) Particular attention should be given to length of service and total years of experience with regard to low-end adjustments.
- 5) We would like to express our appreciation to the Vice President and Associate Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education and to Dr. Milton Baker for their assistance in collecting and analyzing the data incorporated in this report. We would also like to express our appreciation to the Deans of the various University Campuses for their responses to a number of questions submitted by the Faculty Welfare Committee.

The Chair reminded the group that the motion needed no second, and he asked for discussion.

Senator Charles Walker (Union) objected to the proposed method of awarding pay increases called for in recommendation two. Professor Curlovic responded that raises on the Sumter Campus have recently been awarded in that manner.

Associate Vice President Gardner commented that the implementation of recommendation two had the "potential for a nightmare." To illustrate his point, he used a projected salary increase of 2% for classified state employees. If the administration accepted the recommendation, it would be obligated to provide faculty members with a 2% across-the-board increase plus additional merit raises. The State, however, would only give the University Campuses about 70% of the funds needed to award all unclassified personnel a 2% pay raise. The balance of the increase must come from fees and other monies in the operations budget. All salary increases awarded to faculty are considered merit. Across-the-board raises are not given to unclassified employees by the Office of the System Vice President, but local administrators may choose to give them. A 2% raise package theoretically provides a spread of 0 to 4%. During the past three years, salary increases, including promotions, have been funded by the State and by the operations portions of local budgets. Local money has come from accounts for travel, library books, equipment, and maintenance. This coming year, only one of the five University Campuses will receive more formula money than last year, which makes the implementation of automatic, across-the-board raises even more difficult. A 4 to 7½% budget cut is anticipated for next year. The Deans of the University Campuses have "done wonders" the last three years, but it could be very difficult to guarantee that this is done on a continuing basis because of the way we are allocated money by the State.

Professor Curlovic maintained that if all classified state employees are guaranteed a certain percentage increase in their salaries, it seems illogical for faculty to receive less. There is concern among members of the Welfare Committee that while University Campuses Faculty are denied certain benefits because they cannot be provided for all other state employees, we cannot be guaranteed as large a salary package as other state workers. Senator Curlovic cited a discrepancy between USC-Columbia salary figures published in an AAUP study and those provided by the University. He stated that the former source listed average salary increases for Columbia as follows: professor 5.1%, associate professor 6.1%, assistant professor 5.4%, and instructor 7.6%. The University gave a figure of 3%.

Dr. Duffy expressed surprise at the higher figures quoted by Professor Curlovic. He stated that over the last three years, raises for faculty on the University Campuses have been about 2% greater than those received by their counterparts on the Columbia Campus.

Professor Gardner said that the administration is in the difficult position of having to implement a system that is determined at the state level. There are those who would like to pursue the logic of the Committee's argument to the ultimate conclusion of eliminating unclassified categories and the merit concept entirely and giving all faculty comparable, across-the-board pay raises. He stated that for years colleges and universities have maintained that faculty should be awarded on the basis of merit. This means that in order for some to get 6% or 8%, others may receive 0% to 2%. The Associate Vice President stated that a choice must be made between merit and standardized, across-the-board raises, and he added that the administration has chosen not to use the latter approach.

Referring to a previous salary package, Professor Curlovic said the point is that there should be more money for faculty who perform their duties satisfactorily, and when there are sufficient funds available, such employees should not receive less than the raise guaranteed to other state workers. They should be guaranteed the same pay increase as part of the merit pay plan. He added that he understood there were problems with the availability of money.

The Chair asked for further discussion. Hearing none, he called the question. The motion carried.

C. Intra-University Services and Communication--  
Professor Shari Lohela (Lancaster)

Senator Lohela reported that she had several things to present from the Committee. The first, introduced for information and feedback from local campuses, is a "Report on the Establishment of New Courses, Including Those Carrying the

UCAM Designation." Professor Lohela stated that the Report expresses concern about the legitimacy, credibility, and transferability of UCAM courses originating on the University Campuses, including those carrying the UCAM designation. The Report reads as follows:

The following report was compiled to provide a base for the establishment of guidelines for courses bearing the UCAM designation. After polling the various campuses the following concerns were stated:

- 1) that Columbia and the other Four-Year Campuses may view this designation with suspicion, seeing it as a way to get academically inferior courses approved, as a way to circumvent problems in getting a course approved through the normal channels, or as a way to boost FTEs;
- 2) that the use of the UCAM designation reinforces the misconception that the University Campuses are junior colleges or tech schools;
- 3) that these courses may not satisfy baccalaureate degree requirements; and
- 4) that the UCAM designation should be used sparingly, if at all.

It was clear that most campuses had serious reservations about the use of this designation. Nevertheless, this committee was charged with developing guidelines for UCAM courses and, consequently, the following guidelines for review of UCAM and all other courses originating at the University Campuses are proposed:

- 1) approval of the appropriate campus committees, faculty organization, and administrators, with committee votes recorded and all positions stated for or against;
- 2) rationale for offering the course, including why the campus wishes to make it a part of its curriculum, who will teach it and his/her credentials, whether additional costs are involved and if so, where the money will come from, grading system (standard, pass/fail, audit), syllabus, course description, adequacy of library (or other) resources, supporting evidence of the academic integrity of the proposed course, and whether the course is essential to an existing or developing program;
- 3) submission of the proposed course to the IUSC committee for its approval or rejection; and

- 4) if approved, the IUSC will:
  - a) designate the proposed course as a UCAM course, or
  - b) if deemed appropriate, support for the proposal will be sought from the appropriate department of the degree granting institution and will be sent to the relevant curriculum committee for incorporation into their curriculum.

Senator Lohela added that a request from USC-Union for a UCAM course entitled "Introduction to Student Publications" was rejected by the Committee because of questions about its academic content and concerns regarding the wisdom of using the UCAM designation for the course.

The second document introduced from the IUSC Committee was a "Mechanism for Feedback Between the Courses and Curriculum Committee Representative and University Campuses." The proposal was submitted by Robert Castleberry (Sumter), the University Campuses representative to the Courses and Curriculum Committee, and approved unanimously by the IUSC Committee. It was presented as a formal motion for Senate approval, and Professor Lohela read it as follows:

- 1) The Academic Dean of each University Campus will need to send to the University Campuses' representative to the Courses and Curriculum Committee a copy of their course offerings as soon as they are available.
- 2) The representative will keep an updated list of current course offerings and will use this list to evaluate the importance of proposed changes considered by the Courses and Curriculum Committee.
- 3) If a change is contemplated that will affect one or more University Campuses, the Academic Dean(s) of the appropriate campus(es) will be contacted.
- 4) The representative will report to the University Campuses Faculty Senate:
  - a) changes to programs
  - b) changes to courses taught at the University Campuses
  - c) information on some experimental courses
- 5) NOTE:
  - a) The representative will have specific information on all changes proposed to the Committee. Interested faculty can contact the representative for this information.
  - b) Faculty who teach in specific areas can contact the representative for the names of other faculty who teach in the same area.

As the motion required no second, the Chair opened the floor for discussion. Professor Gardner said that when curricula matters affecting the University Campuses are discussed in Columbia, the Office of the System Vice President is generally contacted by the Provost's representative who also sits on the Courses and Curriculum Committee. In addition, the System Vice President is also notified of all agendas for that Committee. The Associate Vice President felt it would be helpful if the motion called for notification of the Office of the System Vice President under item three.

Senator Lohela moved that the third item be amended to read:

If a change is contemplated that will affect one or more University Campuses, the Academic Dean(s) of the appropriate campus(es) and the Office of the System Vice President will be contacted.

The motion to amend was seconded. There was no further discussion, and the amendment was passed. Chairman Powers asked for additional discussion on the original motion as amended. Hearing none, he called the question and the Senate approved the motion.

A third motion was then introduced from the IUSC Committee--a proposal from USC-Fort Jackson to strengthen its associate degree requirements as follows:

1) Requirements	Semester Hours	
	<u>AA</u>	<u>AS</u>
ENGL 101, 102.....	6	6
Afro-American Studies; Art; English (200-level or higher); Foreign Language; History; Music; Philosophy (except 110, 111); Religious Studies; Theatre and Speech; Women's Studies 111.....	9-10	6-7
Anthropology; Economics; Geography; Government and International Studies; Psychology, Sociology, Women's Studies 112.....	9	6
Astronomy; Biology; Chemistry; Computer Science; Geology; Marine Science; Mathematics; Philosophy 110, 111; Physics; Statistics; Women's Studies 113.....	6-8	6-8

Mathematics (other than MATH 100)..		6
Electives.....	<u>27-30</u>	<u>27-30</u>
TOTAL	60	60

- 2) Cumulative 2.0 GPR
- 3) Fifteen semester hours earned at USC-Fort Jackson

There was no discussion and the Chair called the question. The motion was adopted.

Professor Lohela presented a final motion from the IUSC Committee--a proposal from the Union Campus to strengthen requirements for its Associate Degree in Science in Secretarial Science. It reads:

Current Requirements (60 hours)

- I. General Education (15 hours)
  - ENGL 101 Composition
  - ENGL 102 Composition and Literature
  - HIST 110 Intro American History
  - PSYC 101 Intro Psychology
  - RETL 149 Basic Economics
- II. Commercial Education (27 hours)
  - OADM 142 Typewriting II
  - OADM 144 Business Math
  - OADM 146 Shorthand II or OADM 242 Machine Dictation
  - OADM 160 Records Control
  - RETL 161 Functional Accounting I
  - OADM 243 Word Processing or OADM 245 Dictation and Trans
  - OADM 247 Secretarial Procedures or OADM 249 Legal
  - OADM 342 Business Communications
  - BADM 324 Survey of Commercial Law
- III. Possible Electives (others with consent) (18 hours)
  - OADM 141 Typewriting I
  - OADM 145 Shorthand I
  - RETL 162 Functional Accounting II
  - RETL 260 Income Tax Procedures
  - BADM 290 Intro to Data Processing
  - RETL 344 Personal Organization and Supervision

## Suggested Program

### Regular Student

Year	Fall	Spring	Summer
First	ENGL 101	ENGL 102	
	OADM 144	OADM 142	
	UNIV 101	HIST 110	
	OADM 141 or elect	PSYC 101	
	OADM 143 or elect	CSCI 101 or elect	
Second	OADM 145 or elect	OADM 146 or 242	
	RETL 161	RETL 162, 344 or elect	
	RETL 149	BADM 324	
	OADM 160	OADM 243	
	OADM 342	OADM 247	

### Proposed Requirements (60 hours)

#### I. General Education (15 hours)

ENGL 101 Composition  
ENGL 102 Composition and Literature  
HIST 110 Intro American History  
PSYC 101 Intro Psychology  
RETL 149 Basic Economics

#### II. Commercial Education (36 hours)

OADM 142 Typewriting II and/or OADM 238 Adv  
Typewriting  
OADM 144 Business Math  
OADM 146 Shorthand II or OADM 242 Machine Dictation  
OADM 160 Records Control  
OADM 243 Word Processing or OADM 245 Dictation and  
Trans  
OADM 247 Secretarial Procedures or OADM 249 Legal  
OADM 342 Business Communications  
BADM 222 Survey of Accounting  
BADM 225/6 Principles of Accounting  
BADM 324 Survey of Commercial Law

#### III. Suggested Electives (others with consent) (9 hours)

OADM 141 Typewriting I  
OADM 143 Computer Keyboarding  
OADM 145 Shorthand I  
CSCI 101 Intro to Computer Concepts  
BADM 290 Intro to Data Processing  
BADM 335 Federal Taxation  
THSP 140 Public Communication  
UNIV 101 Student in University

## Suggested Program

### Regular Student

Year	Fall	Spring	Summer
First	ENGL 101	ENGL 102	
	OADM 144	OADM 142	
	HIST 110	RETL 149	
	OADM 141 or elect	PSYC 101	
	UNIV 101 or elect	BADM 222	
Second	OADM 145 or elect	OADM 146 or 242	
	OADM 238	BADM 226	
	BADM 225	BADM 324	
	OADM 160	OADM 243	
	OADM 342	OADM 247	

Professor Dockery said he counted only 33 hours of proposed coursework under Section II (Commercial Education) rather than the 36 hours written in the document. Sal Macias (Sumter) noted the listing of OADM 142 and/or OADM 238. If both of these courses are taken in addition to the other commercial education requirements, 36 hours would be earned. The Chair asked members of the assembly to correct their copies of the proposal so that the number of hours in Section II (Commercial Education) of the proposed requirements to 33 to 36.

Professor Gardner strongly urged that, if the proposal is adopted, the Union Campus notify Information Services so that the changes may be included in the new bulletin.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Powers called for a vote on the motion, which was adopted by the body.

Senator Lohela reported that Bob Costello (Sumter) had been elected Chairman of the IUSC Committee for 1987-88.

#### V. Executive Committee--Professor Greg Labyak (Salkehatchie)

Professor Labyak reported on a number of items discussed at the April meeting of the Executive Committee which had not already been brought to the attention of the Senate. Rod Sproatt noted that University Campuses have higher standards and costs than technical schools, and he suggested that we stand firm if TEC wishes to add to the proposed list of transferable courses it offers. Dr. Duffy said that both TEC and the University were going out of their way to avoid conflicts, and Associate Vice President Gardner added that where legislatures have had to settle disputes between university systems and community colleges, the former have lost some autonomy and the number of transferable courses has increased. Professor Gardner informed the Committee that the Vice President has agreed to a recommendation from USC-Lancaster calling for the termination of a tenured faculty appointment. President Holderman has appointed



an ad hoc committee to deal with the matter. Don Curlovic voiced concern about 1) the practice of awarding salary increases in dollar amounts rather than on a percentage basis, and 2) the problem faced by long-time employees on University Campuses whose salary is not commensurate with their length of service. Vice President Duffy agreed to investigate the latter concern, and the attention of the group also focused briefly on the policy of some campuses not to allow full-time faculty to teach overloads. Chairman Powers announced that copies of The Columbia Faculty Manual have been received on some University Campuses, and he said that our Campuses are not mentioned on the page dealing with faculty organization. Dr. Duffy responded that with regard to such matters, The University Campuses Faculty Manual is as official for us as The Columbia Faculty Manual.

The Secretary mentioned additional matters discussed by the Executive Committee earlier in the day. In discussing degree requirements for USC-Fort Jackson (University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, April 24, 1987, pages 13-14) concerns were expressed regarding science and math. The Committee considered implications of the 1988 admissions requirements, and it passed the following resolution for submission to the full Senate:

WHEREAS Associate Vice President John N. Gardner has demonstrated leadership in his innovative work on the Freshman Year Experience, and

WHEREAS his conferences have become an annual event of major proportions, and

WHEREAS Professor Gardner has brought national and international recognition to the University of South Carolina, and specifically to the University Campuses System;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the University Campuses Faculty Senate acknowledges these superlative efforts and expresses its sincere appreciation.

The Chair invited discussion on the resolution and then called for a vote. The resolution was unanimously approved by the Senate, and Associate Vice President Gardner was given a round of applause. Chairman Powers then called for a ten-minute recess.

Upon reconvening the body, Chairman Powers called on Professor Logue to present the report of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee which had been postponed earlier.

Professor Logue stated that the Committee, after considering Rod Sproatt's proposal on the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee and related information from the University Campuses and from the System Legal Department, agreed upon the following motion for presentation to the Senate:

Organization. Each campus will elect both of its representatives to this Committee by October of each academic year. No one who participates in administrative review of candidates shall be elected to this Committee.

At least one member of the Committee from each campus shall be at the associate or full professor level.

All of the members of the Committee shall be tenured.

No person shall serve as a Committee member for longer than three consecutive years.

No faculty member may serve on the Committee during the year in which his/her case receives active consideration.

All applications for tenure and/or promotion in academic rank should be submitted to the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Committee will not normally recommend promotion for anyone who is not currently engaged in teaching, with the exception of Librarians.

Procedures. The Committee shall review the Tenure and Promotion files of applicants during January. Each file will be kept in the Office of the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education and will be used as the primary source for evaluating faculty tenure and promotion.

The Committee will elect a chairman to preside over the Committee and communicate the vote count of each decision with the appropriate recommendation to the Office of the Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education by February 15.

After the discussion of each case, the Committee members shall vote by secret ballot on tenure and promotion as separate issues. The vote of "Yes," or "No," or "Abstain" shall indicate:

1. Recommended for promotion
2. Recommended for tenure
3. Not recommended for promotion at this time
4. Not recommended for tenure at this time
5. Not recommended for tenure (this category is reserved for cases where the faculty member has served the maximum probationary period in any rank).

For candidates receiving a vote to recommend by the Committee, the chairman of the Committee will have a letter prepared stating:

"The University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee met on date and recommends name of candidate for promotion and/or tenure."

For candidates receiving a vote by the Committee not to recommend, the chairman will have a letter prepared for the candidate stating:

"The University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee met on date and does not recommend name of candidate for promotion and/or tenure."

Each letter will be signed by the chairman of the Committee; each candidate will be notified of the Committee's decision by the end of February.

Votes on all questions will pass by simple majority.

Any applicant dissatisfied with the recommendation of the Committee may appeal in writing to the Committee, through the Committee chairman, within two weeks of the receipt of his/her notification.

The System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education shall transmit the files with his/her recommendations to the President by March 31. Applicants who are denied promotion and/or tenure during the administrative review by the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees may appeal through channels to the appropriate reviewing authority up to and including the Board of Trustees.

The Chair invited discussion on the motion. Dr. Duffy, referring to the last paragraph, stated that the tenure and promotion review process does not include the Provost. Chairman Powers inquired whether there was any objection to striking the words "the Provost" from that paragraph. Hearing none, he ordered the change.

Professor Curlovic called attention to the section stating that applications for tenure and/or promotion are to be submitted to the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee. He wondered whether all the necessary materials are to come from the Campus Dean. Professor Sproatt answered that he assumed applications were to be forwarded through the normal channels.

Senator Costello wished to know whether the proposal contained "anything radical," or was simply an examination of procedures. Professor Logue replied that there was not much in the proposal which was new, except the election of both Committee members from each campus, which was passed earlier by the Senate.

Professor Macias asked if the proposal would eliminate division chairpersons from membership on the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee. Representative Logue responded affirmatively.

David McCollum (Beaufort) inquired about the meaning of "appropriate reviewing authority" in the last paragraph.

Professor Logue responded that the appropriate authority is where the unsuccessful applicant would direct his/her appeal.

Tandy Willis (Union) wondered about the possibility of telling unsuccessful applicants how the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee voted. Senator Logue said that question had been considered and there was some discussion about the use of the vote count. The original proposal (University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, February 13, 1987, Attachment 4) included provisions for revealing the actual vote to unsuccessful applicants and informing successful individuals when their applications received unanimous approval. It was felt that a unanimous negative vote might later be used against an applicant. Professor Willis mentioned that some local tenure and promotion committees do reveal the vote count. On the issue of informing unsuccessful candidates of the reasons for a negative decision (a provision included in Professor Sproatt's initial proposal), Representative Logue said that was not included in the present motion because of the opinion of persons in the System Legal Department and on the University Campuses that it could lead to a great deal of trouble. Professor Willis stated that a candidate who was not recommended for tenure and/or promotion would therefore not know the reason(s) why he/she was turned down. Senator Logue agreed, and added that perhaps the matter of tenure and promotion criteria would need to be addressed later. He observed that standards could vary if left up to the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee each year.

Professor Willis expressed curiosity about the phrasing "the chairman of the Committee will have a letter prepared." Senator Logue answered that the thought was the chairman may wish to have a secretary type the letter rather than typing it himself/herself. Professor Willis also called attention to the second paragraph, which reads "At least one member of the Committee from each campus shall be at the associate or full professor level." He moved that the paragraph be amended to read "At least one representative from each campus to the Committee shall be at the associate or full professor level." The motion on the amendment was seconded and there was no further discussion. The question was called and the amendment carried.

Chairman Powers called for further discussion on the motion from the Rights and Responsibilities Committee as amended. There being none, he called the question and the motion was adopted.

An additional item reported by Professor Logue was that Charles Walker (Union) was elected chairman of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee for the 1987-88 academic year.

## VI. Reports of Special Committees.

### A. University Library Committee--Professor Sherre Dryden (Salkehatchie)

The Secretary read the minutes of the February 25 meeting of the Library Advisory Committee for Professor Dryden (Attachment 4).

Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster) expressed concern about the possible reorganization of the Library Committee, with some members to be elected by the Columbia Faculty Senate and others appointed by the President (paragraph 3). He wondered about the status of the representative elected to the Committee by the University Campuses Faculty Senate, since that representative was not mentioned in the Committee's discussion. The Secretary said he would communicate the concern to Professor Dryden, and he reminded the body that the issue was to be taken up by the Columbia Faculty Senate. Senator Nunnery moved that our representative to the University Library Committee be instructed to work closely with Dr. Duffy's Office to insure that the University Campuses retain their representation on that Committee.

The motion was seconded, and Chairman Powers asked for discussion. He called the question and the motion was adopted. The Secretary was requested to prepare a letter informing the new representative to the University Library Committee.

### B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses--Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter)

Senator Macias delivered Professor Castleberry's report. He said the Committee had met four times since the last meeting of the Senate. The next meeting, scheduled for Wednesday, April 29, will probably be the last before a new committee is formed. The art program is being revised, and system faculty have met to discuss the matter. A proposal to revise the Fall 1988 standards was rejected by the Columbia Faculty Senate. The following standards will still apply:

- 1) Math 122 and higher, or two computer science courses, or two statistics courses, or two philosophy courses;  
Math 122 and one computer science course, or one statistics course, or one philosophy course;
- 2) twelve hours of social sciences, including a history and a fine arts course.

C. University Faculty Welfare Committee--  
Professor Jerry Currence (Lancaster)

Professor Currence reported that the Committee met in Columbia on April 1. Committee members received salary statistics for the Columbia Campus and comparative salary data for ten southeastern state universities for 1978-1987. He said that full professors at USC have not fared badly relative to their counterparts in other states, maintaining about a number five ranking. Associate professors, however, have slipped from fifth to ninth place over the years. These salary data will be studied in greater detail at future meetings. Under the leadership of Dr. Jim Fraser, considerable work has been done in preparing a questionnaire dealing with faculty benefits. All campuses will participate in the project if everything goes according to schedule, and the Committee is requesting that University Campuses Faculty participate in the survey, which covers current benefits as well as preferences regarding possible future benefits. An open meeting of the Committee has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 3, 1987 from 12:30 to 1:30 p.m. in the auditorium at Calcott College to discuss faculty benefits.

Professor Gardner asked Senator Currence to compare the salary information provided for the University Faculty Welfare Committee with that received by the University Campuses Faculty. Professor Currence replied that all he has obtained as a member of the systemwide Committee is a breakdown of salaries by colleges, departments, and faculty rank.

D. Academic Planning Committee--Professor Bob Group  
(Salkehatchie)

The Secretary reported for Professor Group. He said the final meeting of this year's Committee took place on April 21, and he read the following summary of the Committee's activities during the 1986-87 academic year:

The Committee met monthly throughout the academic year. At the initial meeting the chairman requested members to poll their colleagues and identify areas of concern which might be appropriate for the Committee to address.

Coordination of curricula and admission requirements within the System were defined as areas of concern. Professor John Gardner and Dr. John Duffy were most helpful in reviewing the development of the system. In response to the Committee's request, Professor Gardner provided a detailed review of the status of actions taken or not taken based upon the System Review Panel, 1981-1982. After much discussion during the course of several meetings, the committee recommended that:

- 1) the appropriate University officer collate and define residency requirements for all degrees on all campuses--the aim of such a compilation being to focus attention upon potentially divergent policies;
- 2) the Committee endorse and support in any way practical annual meetings among systemwide discipline faculties, for the purpose of promoting coordination of degree and course offerings;
- 3) the Committee observe that the teaching of upper level and graduate courses throughout the System is an area of concern. Problems associated with this aspect of the University might appropriately form the initial 1987-88 Academic Planning agenda. To this end, Kendrick A. Clements, History, USC-Columbia, has summarized issues discussed (Attachment 5).

E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee--  
Professor Billy Cordray (Beaufort)

Thursday, April 2, in open session, the group considered proposals for 1) a Carolina Institute for Biological Research and Training (USC-Columbia), 2) a Center for Alcohol and Drug Studies (USC-Columbia), 3) a Bachelor of Science degree program in mathematics (USC-Spartanburg), and 4) a Bachelor of Science Degree in chemistry (USC-Spartanburg). All of these proposals were approved unanimously and subsequently passed by the full Board that afternoon. Confidential matters concerning appointments with tenure and honorary faculty titles were also discussed.

F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee--  
Professor B.H. Carraway (Lancaster)

Wade Chittam delivered the report for Professor Carraway. He stated that the Research and Productive Scholarship Committee meets twice each year for the purpose of reviewing applications. About 25 applications were received in the fall, and about half of the applicants received money. The maximum amount per request is \$3,000 and most applicants seek that amount. Professor Chittam said that in most cases the award was reduced to about \$1,000, since a total of only \$15,000 (Gasp! Oh my gosh!) was available. This spring, seventeen applications have been received and the fate of those requests is to be decided on May 1. Applications from University Campuses are reviewed in the same manner as those from Columbia, and Professor Carraway has observed no intent to evaluate them otherwise.

G. System Committee--Professor Tom Powers (Sumter)

Chairman Powers delivered the following report:

The System Committee met on March 5. I was unable to attend the meeting.

The Committee met again on April 1 on the campus of USC-Columbia. Most of the meeting was taken up with discussion of the state of the budget proposals pending before the State Legislature.

The President distributed copies of a new pamphlet, The Report of the President, 1977-86. This is a nicely-done publication showing the accomplishments and progress of the University during the last ten years. It is noteworthy because it begins by stressing that the University is a system, and not a single campus. Throughout the report, appropriate references (not terribly frequent references, but appropriate references) are made to the contributions of the University Campuses. Alas, there are too many inappropriate references to "Two-year campuses." In a further intriguing note, the pamphlet calls attention to the "changing commitment to higher education on the part of the state," noting the decreases in real-value support, and argues that "the University of South Carolina is in reality state assisted rather than state supported...."

The President also distributed copies of his letter to Senator Rembert Dennis, describing his major concerns about this year's budget. (Attachment 6)

The President and Vice President Denton noted that the University has been persistently underfunded, and that tuition increases have been unable to make up the difference. Since 1980, the University has been funded at almost 70 million dollars short of formula, while fee increases over the same period have generated a cumulative total of 19 million dollars. This has left the University with a net shortfall of around 51 million dollars. Vice President Denton noted that, for tuition to make up the shortfall, tuition would have to be increased by \$2,000 per student. Such is the magnitude of the underfunding problem. (Attachment 7)

The Committee discussed the 1988 admissions standards, and noted that if these standards are applied strictly, all public colleges and universities will experience a tremendous decrease in enrollments. A recent study indicates that at no public college or university in the State would as many as half the students now enrolled have qualified for admission under the 1988 standards. Further, the public school system is not



systematically preparing students to meet these requirements. The feeling at present is that it would be disastrous for the University to advocate an alteration or postponement of these standards, yet equally devastating to apply them.

The System Committee is scheduled to meet again on May 6.

Professor Dockery asked whether the Committee had a list of high schools that were not preparing students for the 1988 admissions requirements. The Chair replied that no such specific information was supplied. The implication is that preparations are inadequate statewide. In addition, a large number of college applicants are not recent high school graduates and therefore would not be expected to meet the 1988 standards.

#### VII. Unfinished Business

Chairman Powers asked members of the Senate to turn to page 8 in the February 13 University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes and locate the motion passed at that meeting, which calls for the election of both members of the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee from each campus. He informed the body that since the motion concerns a change in The University Campuses Faculty Manual, it must be voted on again, if it be the will of the Senate. The Chair noted that the motion was essentially redundant, as it was incorporated into another motion from the Rights and Responsibilities Committee which was passed by the Senate earlier in the session (University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, April 24, 1987, pages 17-19). On the other hand, he felt it might be advisable to vote again in case there was a problem with the Rights and Responsibilities motion. He said if there were no objections, the body would reconsider the motion. No objections were voiced and the motion was read as follows:

That the wording of paragraph 3 ("Organization") in The University Campuses Faculty Manual, page 22, be changed.

Present wording: "This committee shall be formed in October of each year and shall consist of one member elected by each campus faculty and one member appointed from each campus by the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education."

Proposed wording (changed underlined): "This committee shall be formed in October of each year and shall consist of two members elected by each campus faculty."

Chairman Powers opened the floor for discussion on the motion. Professor Curlovic observed that it differed from the Rights and Responsibilities Committee proposal, which also addressed the issue of faculty rank held by members of the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee. He wondered whether the present

motion should speak to that issue as well. The Chair responded that the motion before the body would have to be approved in its present form since it was passed in that form at the last meeting.

The Chair invited further discussion. There was none, and he called the question. The motion carried.

Senator Macias inquired whether it was understood that the motion just passed did not supersede the earlier motion from the Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Chairman Powers answered that the two motions were separate. The later one, while redundant, did not supersede the earlier motion.

#### VIII. New Business

The Chair opened the floor for further nominations for Senate offices and Special Committee assignments, and he read the names of those who had been nominated earlier. It was moved and seconded that the nominations be closed and the motion was adopted. Chairman Powers then entertained a motion that the Nominating Committee's slate of nominees be accepted by acclamation. It was moved and seconded, and the body approved the motion. The following individuals were elected for 1987-88:

#### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Vice-Chairman	Greg Labyak (Salkehatchie)
Secretary	Deborah Cureton (Lancaster)
At-Large	Linda Allman (Lifelong Learning)
At-Large	Rick Boulware (Beaufort)

The positions of Chair and Immediate Past Chair are filled by automatic succession. Tandy Willis (Union) will serve as Chair and Tom Powers (Sumter) as Immediate Past Chair.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEES: ONE-YEAR TERMS

Board of Trustees/Faculty Liaison	Billy Cordray (Beaufort)
Curricula and Courses	Robert Castleberry (Sumter)
Research and Productive Scholarship	Noni Bohonak (Lancaster)
University Library	Lori Broome (Union)

The System Committee representative is appointed by Dr. Holderman and is usually the Chair of the Senate.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEES: THREE-YEAR TERMS

University Faculty Welfare	Bill Bowers (Salkehatchie)
----------------------------	----------------------------

Bob Group (Salkehatchie) continues on the University Academic Planning Committee.

Chairman Powers inquired whether there was additional new business. Professor Chittam asked about University Campuses faculty representation in discussions concerning the budget. Associate Vice President Gardner said that the USC Administration has had representatives meet with the Faculty Advisory Committee about the budget. There has also been some discussion in the Columbia Senate about faculty input on budgetary issues. He stated he would look into the matter and notify Professor Chittam and the Chair of the Senate.

The Chair recognized Professor Willis for the purpose of introducing a resolution. Professor Willis moved that the Senate accept the following:

WHEREAS Jimmie E. Nunnery has faithfully served the State of South Carolina for thirty years, and

WHEREAS Jimmie E. Nunnery has unselfishly served the University of South Carolina System in elected public office for fifteen years which include four years in the South Carolina House of Representatives, and

WHEREAS Jimmie E. Nunnery has served the University of South Carolina as a distinguished faculty member at the Lancaster Campus for sixteen years since 1971 and was awarded the Lancaster Campus Distinguished Teaching Award in 1976 and 1977 and the System Distinguished Teaching Award in 1977, and

WHEREAS Jimmie E. Nunnery has also faithfully and unselfishly served the University Campuses Faculty Senate for his entire sixteen-year period as a faculty member at the University of South Carolina in many varied roles including Chair of the Organization, and

WHEREAS Jimmie E. Nunnery has given freely of his time and knowledge to the Senate and has played an integral role in its development and accomplishments;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the University Campuses Faculty Senate, upon the occasion of the announcement of his retirement on June 30, 1987, wishes to acknowledge, applaud, and thank Professor Jimmie E. Nunnery for this invaluable service and dedication to the Senate, the University of South Carolina System, and the State of South Carolina on this twenty-fourth day of April nineteen hundred and eighty-seven.

Professor Willis also moved that the resolution be adopted by acclamation. The resolution was approved by acclamation, and a framed copy was presented to Professor Nunnery.

## IX. Announcements

The Chair announced that Saturday, May 2 marked the 100th birthday of General Henry M. Roberts of Robertsville, SC, author of Roberts' Rules of Order.

Dr. Duffy was recognized to make further presentations. He awarded a plaque to Tom Powers, recognizing his distinguished service as Chair of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, 1986-87.

The Vice President stated that Jimmie Nunnery was the only person in the room who had been involved with the Senate as long as he has. Professor Nunnery served twice as Chairman of the Organization. Dr. Duffy made another presentation to express the appreciation of the faculty and his appreciation as an administrator for all that Jimmie has done. He asked Mary Derrick to bring in a rocking chair, which he said was appropriate for most retirements but perhaps not for Jimmie's. Professor Nunnery received a round of applause from the Senate.

Chairman Powers said that the presence of new senators should be noted. Newly elected representatives were announced as follows: Lancaster--Noni Bohonak and Wayne Thurman, Lifelong Learning--Nancy Washington and Doris Geoghegan, and Sumter--Kay Oldhouser and Jordan Johnson.

Rod Sproatt announced the location of the reception following the meeting.

The Chair announced that he had received an official University Campuses Faculty Senate gavel, and he invited Chairman Elect Tandy Willis to take it and to entertain a motion to adjourn.

In his first official act as Chairman, Professor Willis asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was made and seconded and the Senate adjourned.

ATTENDANCE, APRIL 24, 1987

BEAUFORT

Present

Rick Boulware	R&R
David McCollum	IUSC
Somers Miller	Welfare
Rod Sproatt	Executive

LANCASTER

Present

Wade Chittam	Executive
Deborah Cureton	IUSC
Jerry Currence	R&R
Shari Lohela	IUSC (Chair)
Mark McLean	Welfare
Jimmie Nunnery	R&R

Absent

Darlene McManus	Welfare
Wayne Thurman substituted for Senator McManus	

LIFELONG LEARNING

Present

Linda Allman	R&R
Steve Dalton	IUSC
Linda Holderfield	Executive
John Stine	Welfare

SALKEHATCHIE

Present

Bill Bowers	Welfare
Greg Labyak	Executive
Marion Preacher	R&R
Ali Pyarali	IUSC

SUMTER

Present

Don Curlovic	Welfare (Chair)
Bob Costello	IUSC
Jean Hatcher	R&R
John Logue	R&R (Chair)
Sal Macias	IUSC
Tom Powers	Executive (Chair)
John Varner	Welfare
Carolyn West	IUSC

Absent

Laura Zaidman	R&R
---------------	-----

UNION

Present

Mary Barton	Welfare
Julie Fielder	IUSC
Charles Walker	R&R
Tandy Willis	Executive

REPORT OF THE SYSTEM VICE PRESIDENT  
FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION  
FOR  
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Beaufort, SC  
April 24, 1987

Budget

When the budget left the House, it had added \$9,000,000 to the Budget and Control Board recommendations for all of higher education. This still left higher education short approximately \$9,000,000 when compared to this year's beginning budget. The Senate Finance Committee is now considering the entire budget. The sub-committee on higher education has reported a budget which would restore enough dollars to the bill to bring higher education up to the same level that it was last year. The bill, of course, will have to go through the entire Senate process. Then differences between the two versions will have to be ironed out by a conference committee. It will then go to the Governor, who may veto parts of the bill. Currently, it appears that if the House version of the budget were to be accepted, all campuses would have less money with the exception of Beaufort. Beaufort's situation results from the fact that Beaufort increased its FTE numbers last year. This only serves to point out the importance of recruitment and retention efforts by the faculty in terms of financing our overall program.

In any event, the President has announced that there will be no tuition increase next fall. We have requested a very moderate increase in the student activity fee at Salkehatchie, however, I am not sure that that would be approved in view of the stance that has been taken against any kind of increase in the cost for our students to attend college.

COMMENCEMENTS

The commencements have now been set. The University Campuses' commencements will be held:

1. Beaufort, May 12, 1987--Mr. Flynn Harrell will be the commencement speaker.
2. Union, May 13, 1987--the Reverend Dr. Walter E. Hickman will be the commencement speaker.
3. Lancaster, May 14, 1987--Dr. George Lovell will be the commencement speaker.

4. Salkehatchie, May 18, 1987--The commencement speaker will be Father Thomas Duffy
5. Sumter, May 19, 1987--the commencement speaker will be Major General Stuart E. Barstad.

The Columbia graduation will be held on May 16 at 9:30 am. The speakers will be Pearl Bailey and Governor Campbell. The three Four-Year Campuses will have graduation as follows:

1. Spartanburg, May 9, 1987
2. Coastal Carolina College, May 10, 1987
3. Aiken, May 7, 1987

#### Library Processing Center

In spite of our budget problems and short-falls, under the direction of Linda Allman, Director of the Library Processing Center, and her staff in cooperation with the librarians of all the campuses we are proceeding with the Recon program. The Recon program is the key to an eventual On-Line Catalogue. If we can get the necessary technology for the On-Line Catalogue, we will be better able to serve the information needs of students and faculty throughout the entire University System.

#### Adult Learner Conference

Dean May will be distributing materials on the Adult Learner Conference which is scheduled to be held in Columbia, May 24-27. We have over 100 presentations and anticipate approximately 400 participants at this year's meeting. To judge by the evaluations and comments which were forwarded to us, Last year's meeting was extremely successful. We expect that this year's Conference will be even better. If any faculty member on any of our Campuses is interested in attending, he/she should contact the local Dean who will in turn make arrangements for the faculty member's attendance by contacting Dean May.

#### Union Title III

I wish to take this opportunity to commend Union for appointing a committee to look into the possibility of securing a Title III grant for the campus. If Union should be successful, it will follow Sumter, Lancaster, and Salkehatchie, which have all received grants from this source.

## Beaufort Marketing Study

Beaufort has recently secured the services of Dr. William O. Bearden and Dr. Jesse Teel of the College of Business Administration to conduct a community survey. I think you might be interested in some of the results which are included as part of this report. It appears that at Beaufort, the biggest problem seems to be the fact that many people are, after all these years, unaware of our presence in the community although those who are aware of us seem to think very highly of us. I'm sure that surveys in our other communities would indicate the same thing. The faculty can play a major role in heightening the community awareness and respect for the institutions. We plan to meet with the Deans and representatives of the faculty throughout the System to discuss how we can do a better job of building our images in the community.





UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

April 1, 1987

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Duffy  
FROM: David Hunter *DH*  
SUBJECT: Robert Castleberry Memo

Per your request, I have made inquiries concerning the issues expressed in Robert Castleberry's February 4 memo. Specifically, I discussed the matter with Luke Gunter. Luke informed me that the matter is clearly between the Four-Year Campuses and the University Campuses. Luke conveyed to me that his role consists of maintaining the system and that he assumes this role because the Four-Year Campuses, through their respective faculty senates, control the courses at their campuses. Thus, Luke, while having the capability to allow access to these courses, refuses to do so because he considers it out of his jurisdiction.

In short, the issue appears to be one of respecting the autonomy and diversity of the University System and I do not see that our office can become involved. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Thank you.

mkh



## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

OFFICE OF THE SYSTEM VICE PRESIDENT  
for University Campuses and  
Continuing Education

(803) 777-7695

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT  
FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION  
FOR  
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Beaufort, SC  
April 24, 1987

Campus Visits by Vice Presidents Duffy and Gardner

Due to the very serious budget situation which we are facing on all of our Campuses next year (including Beaufort even though it will get more state funds than it did last year), the System Vice President and I are more interested than ever this year in the impact of recruitment/retention activities and their impact on enrollment and hence funding. Therefore, we have decided that we will visit each of the campuses between now and the start of the fall semester to discuss with individuals on each campus recruitment and retention efforts underway or contemplated. We will also discuss the current status of assessment activities in light of the pending SACS review in 1989-1991 and the recently adopted CHE mandate in this area. To date, we have made one such visit, to Union, on April 14. Salkehatchie will be visited on April 30. We have asked the Deans of the University to arrange these meetings for us in a format we hope to be primarily interactive. We want you folks to inform us about what you're doing in these areas. After we have been to all the campuses, we may wish to schedule a meeting in the fall with representatives from all five campuses to share with each other activities they have underway and anticipated in these three areas. We anticipate that special written documents will also be produced to support these campus visits and that these written pieces will be worth sharing between and among all five Campuses.

University Campuses Participation in CIRP

For many years USC-Columbia has been one of several hundred institutions for higher learning in the United States which has participated in the annual freshman survey which is conducted jointly by the University of California-Los Angeles and the American Council on Education. This research survey instrument is known as the Cooperative Institutional Research Project. This results each year in an annual publication entitled The American Freshmen Fall (1987). It enables each institution to develop a much more thorough, insightful, and empirically based profile on the entering student 1987. We

believe it will enable us to do better planning on our campuses which is of course a criteria for the Southern Association's forthcoming review, i.e., that is to what extent we've collected institutional research data and how do we use it for planning purposes. This effort will be coordinated through our Office with the assistance of David Hunter. This Office will assume all costs for administration of the instrument on the Campuses.

We are also making available to any campus which wishes to participate, an external consultant, Dr. Charles Hatch, who is president of C.W. Hatch Consulting, Inc. Dr. Hatch has developed a model for predicting attrition on college campuses. We are interested in seeing whether or not he can help us get a better handle on this problem and in particular to identify possible programmatic responses for high risk students from the point of view of attrition.

#### FOI Legislation

It appears very likely that revised FOI legislation will be adopted by the General Assembly during the current session to authorize state agencies to release salary information of officials whose privacy is currently protected in this regard. It will be the policy of this Office to cheerfully and cooperatively support whatever the new University and state policy may be. In the meantime, we will continue to cooperate with the University Campuses Faculty Senate in providing faculty salary data under the current guidelines.

#### T&P Workshops

To date, two campuses, USC-Union and Lifelong Learning, have had T&P workshops to inform non-tenured faculty as to the mechanics and criteria for this important process. We commend these two units for providing this service for their colleagues.

#### Support from Office of the System Vice President for Systemwide Faculty Meetings

As in previous years, we have continued this year to provide considerable support for these meetings within the Departments of Foreign Languages, Chemistry, Psychology, History, English, and Sociology. If your discipline has not met this year and you would like it to do so, we urge you to feel free to communicate with your peers in Columbia to express to them our willingness to support such undertakings and providing financial support for travel, meals, occasional speaker, etc. What we generally do is to split the costs with the host department. We do not as a rule underwrite all costs associated with these activities.

### Academic Planning Committee

The Academic Planning Committee has held a number of meetings this academic year to consider such matters as University System residency requirements, cooperation and communication amongst System faculty. These meetings have been held once a month. To date there have been no specific actions taken other than a recommendation to departments to expand their Systemwide faculty meeting activities. This Office has participated in most of these discussions this year and will continue to provide support as requested.

ATTACHMENT 3

Eleven/Twelve Month Faculty

1986-87 Salary	Amount from % Increase	Additional Merit	Low End Adjustment
----------------	------------------------	------------------	--------------------

Nine Month Faculty

1986-87 Salary	Amount from % Increase	Additional Merit	Low End Adjustment
----------------	------------------------	------------------	--------------------

ATTACHMENT 4

Minutes of the Library Advisory Committee  
February 25, 1987

The Library Advisory Committee met in the Conference Room of the Thomas Cooper Library at 3:00 pm on Wednesday, February 25, 1987. Present were David G. Phillips, Chairman, Elmer J. Amma, Owen S. Connelly, Robert L. Oakman and Kenneth E. Toombs. Daniel Barron, Colin Bennett, William J. Eccles, William Nolte, Oliver G. Wood, Jr., and Sherre Dryden were absent.

The Committee discussed a request from Provost Francis T. Borkowski that Women's Studies be given a \$3,000 departmental allocation on a permanent basis. The request was unanimously approved.

The possibility of a reorganization of the Library Committee with part of the members to be elected by the Faculty Senate and part to be appointed by the President was discussed. This matter will be taken up at the March meeting of the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate has requested that the University Administration respond to the Library Committee Report on the Current Status of the Libraries at its March 4, 1987 meeting.

The current status of the library budget was discussed and the Director of Libraries reported as follows:

Because of the 2.6% takeback of funds from the University by the state this year the library will lose 1.7% from its current budget of \$4,926,289 or a reduction of \$83,746. In addition the state has projected a 5.8% reduction of the University's reduced base budget for next year (1987-88) and the library will have to give up a projected 5.67% of its already reduced current budget or \$274,572. This will reduce the base library budget for next year to \$4,567,971.

The total reduction for the two years is \$358,318.

The Director of Athletics, Robert K. Marcum, has given the library, through the University administration, \$504,000. This is the money which the USC Athletic Department was paid by the television networks for the nationally televised football games in the fall of 1986, between USC and the Universities of Miami and Georgia. The Law Library will be given \$20,000 of the money and the other \$484,000 will be given to the Thomas Cooper Library. The funds can be used in both the current year and the next fiscal year. These funds will be used to offset the loss of the \$358,318 and the projected increased cost of library materials for next year.

The Director of Libraries is writing to Mr. Marcum to thank him on behalf of the University Community for his and the Athletic Department's generosity which comes at a time when the Library and the University, desperately need money. Bookplates denoting this gift will be placed in several thousand library books.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
*David G. Phillips*  
David G. Phillips, Chairman

March 17, 1987

To: John Bryan

From: Kendrick A. Clements *KAC*

Re: Graduate programs on the Columbia and university campuses

1. The issue, as raised in the committee meeting today, seems to fall into two parts: the question of graduate faculty status for faculty members on the various campuses other than Columbia; and the future of graduate courses and programs on the various university campuses. The first of these problems seems to become readily soluble if the second were satisfactorily addressed.

2. Simply put, the issue seems to be that the various university campuses aspire to offer more graduate courses and programs, while the faculty of the Columbia campus have serious reservations about the desirability of that.

3. The desire on the part of the various campuses to offer graduate programs is a normal result of growth and development, reflecting better-qualified faculties, student and community demand, and natural ambition for development.

4. On the other hand, there are sound reasons for the Columbia faculty's resistance to such growth. In part, they are concerned that students and resources will be diverted from programs on the Columbia campus that are not adequately supported even now. In part, they are concerned that facilities for graduate instruction do not exist or are inadequate on other campuses (e.g., laboratories, equipment, library resources, etc.).

5. Since graduate education is the most expensive part of the university's educational mission, it is imperative that the institution have and abide by a rational plan in regard to its future growth and development. To that end, the Academic Planning Committee might find it desirable to explore some aspects of the issue. Among the agencies and individuals it might usefully consult are: the Graduate Council, the Graduate School Dean, the Graduate Regional Studies office, the administrators of the university campuses, the Division of University Campuses, the Provost's office, the deans of various colleges and schools, the Commission on Higher Education, and the faculties of various schools or departments, among others.

6. Inasmuch as resources in this state are finite, the committee must consider the possibility that NO graduate programs should develop on the various campuses, and that any now existing should be eliminated. But it is probably more politically and educationally realistic to seek a plan for restricted and controlled growth. Unless such a plan is imposed from above, however, it will be unworkable unless it rests upon a system-wide consensus. Whether such a consensus is achievable is impossible to say at this point, but it would seem logical to suggest that the committee take as its first task trying to find out whether any consensus is possible, and only then the development of a specific plan. Unless there is agreement on the basic premise of limited and controlled growth, nothing else is possible.



## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

April 1, 1987

PRESIDENT

The Honorable Rembert C. Dennis  
 111 Gressette Building  
 P. O. Box 142  
 Columbia, SC 29202

Subject: 1987-88 Appropriation Act

Dear Senator Dennis:

The University of South Carolina is very alarmed about the status of the 1987-88 appropriation. Since 1980-81 the formula has experienced a cumulative shortfall of almost 70 million dollars. During the same time fees have been raised approximately 19 million dollars for a cumulative shortfall of more than 50 million dollars.

The University has committed to no fee increase for next year. This is an action that was considered necessary because we are now the third highest in the Southeast but it is also one which compounds a severe financial burden.

The University realizes the revenue problems the State faces this year but finds it imperative to ask for attention to the CHE formula. Help is needed to bring it above the current funding level of only 88 percent. Such improvement in the formula would benefit all of higher education.

Specifically from the University of South Carolina's point of view, there are acute equipment needs. In the scientific area that totals \$3,012,400. Systemwide computer maintenance problems have an annual commitment of \$3,000,000. Engineering equipment needs total \$1,422,600. All of these are critical equipment needs which have not been funded on a State basis. This issue demands attention for the continued growth and development of the State of South Carolina.

The University R & D Foundation is in the process of constructing the Koger Center which involves city money, county money, private gifts and private bequests. This arrangement however, does require for leasing by the University until the capital obligation is satisfied. This lease is in effect a bridge loan. It was approved in 86-87 for 1/2 year and funded at \$400,000. The necessary lease payment this year is \$800,000, and it is not yet funded. Your attention to this action is desperately needed.



Senator Rembert Dennis  
April 1, 1987  
Page 2

The Research Investment Act is one that is critical to the future growth and development of the State of South Carolina's economy. The University fully realizes that monies are not available in the general fund this year. It would be a definite sign of State support and commitment to the faculty of the University for the State to pass enabling legislation for the Research Investment Act. The University realizes that this action could only be funded in token this year but it could pave the way for future years. More importantly is the message to the many "star" faculty who feel there is not a commitment to education in South Carolina and have left, and their peers who are considering such. Such positive action and future commitment could be the difference in retaining quality faculty for the future of South Carolina.

The University has concern with the following provisos:

1. The 96% salary proviso under the Budget and Control section. This proviso is a particular problem to colleges and universities. The proviso currently provides an exclusion for constitutional officer agencies. It would be to the distinct benefit of higher education if the phrase could be expanded to provide: "Will not apply to constitutional officer agencies and institutions of higher learning."

2. The vacancy policy proviso. During these austere budget times, the University finds it prudent management to postpone filling vacancies. The University concurs with proper position management and in fact does so. The prudent business management of the time is to postpone such positions when possible. It is quite frustrating to University and unit leaders trying to manage such positions when on the one hand, action must be taken to save money for the current crisis and on the other hand, the action of doing such causes the position to be lapsed for the future. As such, we request consideration of the deletion of this proviso.

3. Section 129.2 Subsection 1:  
This section deals with operation and capital cost of auxiliary enterprises with which the University concurs. However, it was never intended to exclude state relief of asbestos abatement. It is critical to the operation of dormitories where our young people live or hospitals where our sick are confined that the proviso be altered to allow state support for asbestos removal.

Senator Rembert Dennis  
April 1, 1987  
Page 3

4. Section 31. ETV Proviso:

The University has concern about potential changes in ETV operations to generate fees. The proviso should be amended so that the charging of fees for educational courses as offered by the University through the ETV network is prohibited.

5. One last change relates to scholarships. Although the University has substantially increased the amount of scholarships given over the last 10 years, the amount we are able to give is still quite limited. In many programs we find we can not attract as many bright, talented students because other schools lure the student away with scholarship packages. These are other state institutions outside of South Carolina. A proviso which would provide institutions the ability to give a limited number of scholarships to talented and gifted students could alter this situation. We respectfully request the proviso relating to no State scholarships be altered to read "provided that the institutions of higher education can give up to 2% of their undergraduate student body State scholarships." This would provide an additional retention tool to maintain the brightest in South Carolina and it would also provide a message to the faculty of higher education that the state does support higher education.

Senator, thank you in advance for your attention to these matters and all you do for higher education.

Sincerely,

Dr. James B. Holderman

rg

cc: The Honorable Senator Garrison  
The Honorable Senator Setzler  
The Honorable Senator McCaulay  
Mr. Charlie Brooks  
Dr. Frank Borkowski  
Dr. R. W. Denton  
Mr. Johnny Gregory  
Mr. Chris Vlahoplus

ATTACHMENT 7

FILENAME: COMPARE

USC-COLUMBIA  
FUNDING COMPARISON

FORMULA ANALYSIS

YEAR	CHE FORMULA RECOMM -A-	STATE APPROP -B-	ANNUAL SHORTFALL B-A=C	CUMM SHORTFALL
1980-81	78,929,582 c	78,430,385 b	(499,197)	(499,197)
1981-82	91,239,559 c	71,838,132 b	(19,461,557)	(19,960,754)
1982-83	98,759,354 c	71,969,592 b	(21,788,752)	(41,749,506)
1983-84	86,291,611 c	78,637,912 b	(7,653,899)	(49,403,405)
1984-85	88,786,792 c	88,159,365 b	(627,427)	(50,030,832)
1985-86	151,171,398 c	98,885,548 b	(52,285,850)	(53,196,682)
1986-87	153,369,080 c	104,361,951	(4,907,129)	(57,203,511)
1987-88	115,799,818 d	103,564,571 a	(12,229,247)	(69,432,758)

FEE ANALYSIS

YEAR	AVERAGE FEE INCREASE	FTE	CUMM FEE INCREASE
1980-81			
1981-82	140	20,969	2,935,660
1982-83	50	20,237	3,947,510
1983-84	(40)	19,432	3,170,230
1984-85	250	18,914	7,898,730
1985-86	160	18,737	10,896,650
1986-87	160	18,871	14,066,978
1987-88	260	18,871	18,973,438
	3		18,973,438

NET SHORTFALL (FORMULA PLUS FEE INCREASE) (58,459,320)

- a Per Ways & Means
- b Taken from B&CB volumes, actual year, source of funds statements
- c Adjusted for pay increases
- d No pay increases included