

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING

USC-Columbia
Lifelong Learning
Fort Jackson, SC
September 15, 1989

THE INFORMAL SESSION

Chair Deborah Cureton opened the meeting by expressing thanks to the Lifelong Learning faculty and to the Fort Jackson staff for the arrangements and accommodations for this Senate. Appreciation was expressed also to Elizabeth Unger for the arrangements for the Executive Committee's retreat on Hilton Head Island this summer. The Chair welcomed the Deans of the University Campuses, the Academic Deans, Vice Chancellor David Hunter, Associate Chancellor for Planning Jim Edwards, and Professor David Millard representing Fred Hicks of USC-Coastal Carolina College.

Campus reports were heard from the following: Deans Boyd, Bashaw, Arnold, Clayton, Anderson, and Davis.

Several new senators were introduced to the Senate: Professor Gordon Haist (Beaufort); Professor Danny Faulkner (Lancaster); Professors Charles Cook, Richard Bell, Nancy McDonald, and John Stafford (Sumter); Professor Tandy Willis (Union).

Before moving the Senate into its various committees, the Chair called on Professor Nancy Washington to explain her efforts as an archivist for the University Campuses Faculty Senate. She explained that she was now in the process of cataloging the Senate minutes and indexing them. She is also compiling pictures and other memorabilia into a scrapbook for posterity. This will be a valuable historical resource and a help especially for new senators. Professor Washington introduced Don Corbett of the continuing education division staff; he will serve as the Senate's photographer. (Many of us already know Don through his excellent work on typing and printing our revised Faculty Manual.) Washington also introduced Clela Dunaway to the Senate; she is a cataloger at LPC and is attending the Senate meeting today as an alternate.

THE FORMAL SESSION

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cureton convened the Senate at 2:00 p.m.

II. CORRECTION/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Professor John Logue (Sumter) made the following correction: page 25, section 6, third paragraph, "Chief Academic Office" should read "Chief Academic Officer."

The minutes of the April 21, 1989, meeting were approved as amended.

III. REPORTS FROM UNIVERSITY OFFICERS

A. DR. ARTHUR K. SMITH, PROVOST

I am glad to be able to meet with you today. First, let me speak on the budget; then I'll say a couple of things about the Tech Colleges' proposal and about the System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee.

I was present earlier this week at the Budget and Control Board when the CHE and the President of Clemson University made their pitch, their budgetary pitch, for the 1990/1991 fiscal year. I think we're going into it with more unity among the public institutions of higher education and between the public institutions and the CHE in making a concerted effort before the General Assembly, showing a higher priority for 100% formula funding. We were also heartened by the expressions of support we've received from Herb Kirsch, chair of the higher education subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee. The priorities that the CHE and the Council of Presidents have agreed upon are full-formula funding with a high priority from the institutions to deal with the faculty salary problem, with a salary increase next year to exceed the national average. Probably, as you know, President Holderman has stated his desire for salary increases of 8% each year until 2001. This remains our goal; we hope to be able to give at least that amount in 1990/1991. We will try to hold educational fees next year at this year's level, pending full-formula (or close to it) funding. There is also an agreement on seeking \$EO million for the Cutting Edge, and that would be a doubling of the current \$5 million for the Cutting Edge programs plus a new \$10 million item that would go for performance funding. With this, institutions could receive additional monies beyond what is provided in the formula if they achieve certain improvement measures as part of the institutional effectiveness outcomes assessments. What the final outcome is going to be we won't know until next May...and much will depend on the fiscal situation of the State in 1990/1991. But there is increasing recognition that if we are going to do something substantial and sustaining for higher education in South Carolina, we probably need to do, as the Department of Education did in 1984. This is to identify new revenue sources for the future.

On the Tech College situation, I know this is a matter of concern for many if not all of you, particularly Sumter, Beaufort, and Salkehatchie. The nine campus proposals from the Tech Colleges went before the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee on October 16. The CHE is expected to act on all these proposals and recommendations November 2. We are told that sometime between now and then the chair of the Senate's higher education committee will convene a series of hearings on the Tech Colleges' proposals. I think these will be very important meetings and I encourage you to encourage your local CHE members to attend, especially members of the local CHE's, to make sure the concerns of the University of South Carolina are heard: wasteful duplication, price competition, and the unfair advantages that Tech may well have in the areas of mission that we have long carved out for ourselves. At the same time, we don't want to overdo opposition to these proposals to be construed as opposition to what the Tech Colleges have historically done with their own mission for the State of South Carolina. It's a difficult political situation; if it passes on November 2, that's the end of it unless the General Assembly somehow decides to investigate further and to do something itself in January.

On the System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee, this was formed last spring to respond to a structural problem. We say we have a unified system in the University of South Carolina, but we have no single system faculty governance body. I as Provost did not have any group to which I could refer questions or problems that were systemic rather than single campus or one or two campuses in nature. I'm not so sure that we need a system wide faculty senate (we have five of them now). The SAPCC has 15 members, 10 of them are faculty: the chairs of the five senates, the chief academic officers from each campus, and one faculty member chosen jointly by those two individuals from each campus. There have been only a couple of meetings thus far, but this committee has dealt successfully with one issue already. That is what catalog governs a student's graduation requirements. This is the catalog under which a student first matriculates, where matriculate means when the student first enrolls as a degree-seeking student. The student is allowed up to eight years to claim the rights of a specific catalog. Also, a student is able to step out for up to five years and still be able to claim the rights of that original catalog. This committee has generated a lot of interest and a lot of concern...concern on the part of some senates that this committee is intended to override or substitute for faculty prerogatives through the faculty governance system. This is not the case. It is a coordinating committee; it is not a legislative committee. We come together to talk about the problems we see in terms of system academic policy coordination. We bring together people who are responsible for getting the word out on our respective campuses. If we are going to recommend changes, quite frankly, those changes will be implemented only through concerted actions of the faculty senates.

There may be things on your minds at this point, and I am open to questions on any subject at this time.

Professor Carolyn West (Sumter): Could you comment further on the fact that there was some interest in reducing the 5-year period in terms of how long a catalog is applicable? Why is there an interest in reducing this time period?

Smith: Five years is a rather generous period of time in terms of other universities. Some have seen this as a woman's issue, and it may well be. Again, we are going into a discussion of this and there is no predetermined outcome.

West: I'd like to suggest that besides this being a woman's issue; it is an issue for our campuses because we have many nontraditional students, particularly those campuses that serve military students. Very often a student will enroll on our campus, be transferred away for a period of three to four years, and then re-enroll to try to complete his degree at Carolina. When you look at this from the perspective of the nontraditional students, women and military, it seems that at least five years is appropriate.

Smith: The meeting which I will convene in about twenty minutes will be for the purpose of setting the agenda for this year. Any policy that we address will then go back to the individual campuses for further discussion.

Dean Meeks (Beaufort): Last year in January, Dr. McMillan raised the possibility of having a system catalog in the sense that all course descriptions and course acronyms reflect a system rather than individual campuses. Will you be looking at this issue?

Smith: This will be an agenda item if someone raises it. I want the proposals to come from the campuses rather than me setting the agenda. Harry McMillan, a professor of engineering in Columbia, chaired the academic planning committee last year. A system catalog is a complicated issue. Each campus, at the same time, wants to know what the scope of its authority is. Should there be a central grading system? We have a system wide computer system, and as such, should it be allowed to drive academic policy? Is the grading system something we should try to hold in common?

Chair Cureton: We are in the process of finding another System Affirmative Action Officer. Where are we as a system in terms of affirmative action goals?

Smith: The question is whether we are making progress in terms of affirmative action. There has been substantial progress in the recruitment of minority students on virtually every campus, undergraduate as well as graduate students. We are not doing nearly as well in terms of recruiting minority faculty and staff. On the Columbia campus, I've been setting aside \$200,000 per year as an incentive to the colleges and schools to recruit well qualified minority faculty and staff, especially those who have earned tenured positions at other places, and with tenure upon initial appointment in Columbia so they would not be subject to the enormous pressures that any faculty have to deal with in terms of meeting criteria for tenure. Another \$200,000 will be added this year. This year we recruited 5 new black faculty members; we lost 4; a net gain of 1. We went from 23 to 24 black faculty who are tenure-track on the Columbia campus, up from 14 two years ago. We are in the process of hiring a new System Affirmative Action Officer. The interviews are nearing completion; an offer will be made to someone shortly.

Professor Chamberlain (Beaufort): What is the status of offering upper-level business courses on the University Campuses?

Smith: We had an outside review from the CHE of the business programs...well qualified evaluators who also happen to do evaluations for AACSB, the major but now not the only accrediting agency for business schools. There was some question of the propriety of the business offerings in non-Columbia locations. , Sumter in particular. That one could receive a baccalaureate degree in business without ever leaving the Sumter campus. The business school in Columbia is very concerned about its AACSB accreditation. Aiken is not even seeking AACSB accreditation; Spartanburg is. Dean Kane's action doesn't affect the relationships between Sumter and Aiken or between Beaufort and Aiken.

Welcome back to another year. It has been a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to speak to you again. Thank you.

B. DR. JOHN J. DUFFY, CHANCELLOR

Dr. Duffy reviewed briefly the items on his written report. (This report appears as an attachment to these minutes.) He then called on Linda Allman to report on the technological progress within DPC and the University Libraries.

Linda Allman: The Assembly of Librarians was established about 13 years ago when librarians from the University and Four Year Campuses decided to meet regularly and discuss mutual problems and share common interests.

The Assembly has helped foster feelings of cooperation within the University library system and has proven to be an effective vehicle for librarians. Last year the Assembly voted unanimously to invite the Vice President of Libraries and Museums and Thomas Cooper Library's new Dean of Libraries to become members.

This collective and cooperative approach to library issues by our system libraries has strengthened our position. Faculty and administrators have become more aware of the importance of libraries and their interrelationship in the university setting.

In general, programs consist of discussions of current areas of interest, individual campus library reports, innovations, and demonstrations on new technologies.

The electronic mail system, the foundation of our system-wide interlibrary loan, was one of the earlier Assembly projects; spearheaded by Linda Holderfield. The e-mail system facilitates the flow of requests for additional books and periodical articles that are so necessary to the research efforts of University and Four Year Campus faculty.

In the early 1980's, it was the Assembly of Librarians that planted the seed leading to the present NOTIS project. Our librarians began garnering the support of faculty and administrators for RECON (the conversion of titles in the card catalog into machine-readable format, which is the basis for an on-line catalog system). They also formed committees that studied various aspects of library automation and invited librarians from the Thomas Cooper Library to become involved.

At recent Assembly programs, we viewed several excellent videos describing to new students and faculty how to use a particular campus library. These videos were cooperative efforts between the librarians and educational television. Also when the new technology of CD-ROM databases first came on the scene, demonstrations of various databases were set up. Another example of new technology is the PC-based material ordering system developed at LPC, which will make ordering immeasurably easier for campus library staff.

At our most recent retreat, many important issues were discussed such as communicating to faculty and students about library resources, USCAN, library support for off-campus sites, and SACS. I'm going to discuss each of these briefly.

Dr. Duffy encouraged us to seek opportunities to instruct administrators and faculty about the latest library resources such as NOTIS, CD-ROM databases, telefacsimile transmission and electronic mail capabilities -- all of which enable us to increase access to information for researchers throughout the system.

Our illustrious Senator Ellen Chamberlain who heads the USC Beaufort Self-Study team gave an extremely helpful explanation of USC's reaccreditation process. In particular, she cautioned us that libraries will be scrutinized for their contributions to student success and satisfaction rather than the number of books or personnel or the amount of study space available.

A preliminary version of USCAN, USC's on-line catalog, became available last May. The database is currently being reloaded to take advantage of a software program that will make it possible to see the specific collection location of an item within each library collection. This load will not take care of the problem of not being able to see just you campus holdings; however, that issue is being brought to the attention of the vendor, NOTIS, who is responsible for designing the software.

The on-line catalog is a powerful tool which gives our students, faculty and staff access to over one million bibliographic citations in the USC Library System. And unlike the card catalog, USCAN has the powerful key-word searching capability that is already benefiting researchers.

After books are loaded in USCAN, then our attention will turn to periodicals. The cataloging module is expected to be implemented this spring with the circulation module added next.

Two other important NOTIS issues discussed were system ID's and bar-coding of materials.

Senator Susan Smith and Librarian at USC Union have just completed installation of dial access into USCAN at Laurens.

Shari Lohela, the Librarian at USC Lancaster, is working closely with the Kershaw County Library staff to provide access to USCAN for USC students who attend classes in Kershaw.

LPC staff and the Dean of Lifelong Learning, Sally Boyd, have worked out access to USCAN for USC's Lifelong Learning students and faculty. This interlibrary loan service will also be offered to the other four college and universities having courses at the Fort.

I've only mentioned a few of the biggest issues that our Assembly of Librarians organization has been involved with in the past or is currently in the process of doing. I for one am looking forward to the future which promises to be even more exciting than past accomplishments.

Dr. Duffy then called on Jim Edwards, Associate Chancellor for Planning, to address the University's progress in the SACS Self-Study.

Associate Chancellor Edwards: I feel a little like I'm preaching to the choir as all of you are involved in the self-study. I've recently attended a luncheon here in Columbia where Dave Bell was present. He is the chair of the Columbia campus self-study. I realized at this luncheon that the University Campuses are ahead of other campuses. We have completed our mission statements and goal statements and are now in the assessment process. All of the University Campuses have completed preliminary drafts of the assessment process. Each campus is approaching assessment from its own perspective. Portfolios, questionnaires, and existing student surveys are being used by the individual campuses as they see the need. I have attended and have received reports where campus faculty meetings have been held in which the self-study was the agenda item. The main thing is that we are ahead of the game right now. Let's keep up the good work.

C . PROFESSOR JOHN GARDNER, VICE CHANCELLOR

Professor Gardner could not meet with the Senate today. (His written report appears as an attachment to these minutes.)

IV. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE Professor John Logue: The Rights and Responsibilities Committee convened at 10:40 a.m. The first order of business was to elect Bruce Nims of USC Lancaster as secretary.

Chairman Logue then stated the two charges facing the committee: a general review of the latest version of the University Campuses Faculty Manual, and a specific concern about a T&P candidate's access to administrative recommendations in the candidate's file.

Jerry Dockery, Chairman of the Faculty Manual Revision Committee, then oriented new members concerning the organization of the University Campuses system and the place of the Manual in the system. Various concerns about wording and definitions were discussed and clarified. Also, there were opinions in favor of spelling out in the Manual the normal procedures followed in forming the search committee for a new Dean of the University. Dockery then reminded everyone that all concerns will be considered, responded to, and then reported. He hopes final approval for the new Manual will be obtained from the Senate by February. The

committee commended Professor Dockery for his forceful and effective leadership in getting the new Manual together.

The second charge to the committee, to examine T&P procedures, specifically access to the Dean's and other administrative recommendations by a T&P candidate, was discussed and referred to the next meeting of the Faculty Manual Revision Committee.

The Faculty Manual Revision Committee will next meet November 3, 1989, at 3:00 p.m., 900 Assembly Street.

B. THE WELFARE COMMITTEE

Professor Mary Barton: We are gravely concerned that a trend seems to be developing to decrease fringe benefits. While we are aware that such decreases are originating from the State legislature, such activities can partially negate recent salary advances. We will continue to monitor this situation.

This committee is interested in gaining more information regarding the Freedom of Information Act and suggests that a speaker be found to address this topic.

The committee discussed policies on the University Campuses that deal with the availability of vehicles and/or compensation for faculty travel on university business.

Finally, the Welfare Committee asks that the previously retested salary information (see University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, April 1989) be made available to us by October 31, 1989, enabling us to discuss that information at our next meeting on November 17, 1989.

C. SYSTEM AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Professor Paul Stone: Greg Labyak presented lobbying materials from the Tech system; these were discussed within committee.

The faculty exchange program was discussed in some detail. It was noted that the Wisconsin faculty exchange program, though available, was not used.

The possibility of a faculty development manual was discussed. Such topics to include in it would be computer courses, travel vouchers, how-to's, etc.

The Executive Committee's charge to this committee to review the status of the Faculty Resource Manual was declined, as this committee did not see the need for such a manual. We feel that a manual of this nature would be quickly out-of-date.

Associate Chancellor for Planning Jim Edwards met with this committee today. His purpose is to coordinate the self-study among the University Campuses. This committee requests that Jim Edwards make a report to the Senate at all subsequent meetings during the self-study process. We recommend that the self-study be conducted on a system-wide basis rather than be developed by each campus; this makes for a lot of repetitive work.

The Executive Committee's charge on articulation was accepted. We discussed and will continue to investigate problems with transferring coursework from campus to campus. Faculty criteria differ among the University Campuses, and there are also the catalog problems for students.

This committee declined the charge to investigate USC's retention and recruitment efforts, as this is more an administrative/clerical responsibility.

Finally, this committee offers a resolution to be adopted by the Senate concerning a proposal by the South Carolina Technical Education System. This resolution was discussed, amended, and adopted as amended by the University Campuses Faculty Senate. It appears in its final form as an attachment to these minutes.

Cureton: This resolution will be forwarded to Dr. Duffy's office.

Dr. Duffy: Our office will send this resolution to the President.

Cureton: Professor Stone, did your committee determine that the faculty resource manual has no value?

Stone: Yes.

Cureton: We as a Senate have the responsibility of spreading necessary information to the University Campuses faculty. Your committee's charge was to review the need for this manual and to investigate improvements to this resource.

V . EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Rick Boulware: Since the Senate met in April, the Executive Committee has had three meetings: the annual summer retreat (held this year on Hilton Head Island), a meeting two weeks ago on the Columbia campus, and its meeting this morning. Today, we were joined by Professor David Millard from USC-Coastal Carolina College, representing Fred Hicks, chair of the Coastal Carolina Senate, and by Billy Cordray, director of the Hilton Head Island program.

Our first order of business today was a discussion led by Billy Cordray concerning a resolution to honor Ada Thomas, a retiring Assistant Dean in the College of Business who has been a real friend to the faculties and students of the University Campuses. Cordray will report to the Senate at its November meeting on the progress made here.

Deborah Cureton informed the committee of a questionnaire forthcoming to each campus regarding affirmative action procedures on the various campuses.

Discussion was held regarding the expediting of transcript reviews for students transferring into or around the USC system; decided to refer this matter to the articulation committee, the System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee.

Chair Cureton appointed Tandy Willis (USC Union) Parliamentarian for the University Campuses Faculty Senate.

Finally, the Executive Committee offers a resolution to be adopted by the Senate in response to the demands of Representative Mike Fair. This resolution, which appears as an attachment to these minutes, was passed unanimously.

VI. REPORTS FROM SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Professor John Catalano: This committee met September 8 in Thomas Cooper Library. Dr. Dan Barron, College of Librarianship, was elected to chair the committee for the 1989/90 school year.

The book and periodical budget for 1989/90 was discussed. The budget calls for an increase of roughly \$100,000 which will be spent by library selectors working with individual department and area representatives. An extended discussion about the use of library selectors ensued.

The on-line catalog project is progressing. Within the month, 99% of Thomas Cooper Library holdings will be on-line, although the other campuses are still only at 60%. There will soon be 175 terminals in place to access these holdings. By the end of the year, Thomas Cooper Library hopes to do all cataloging and circulation on-line.

Library insurance coverage has been increased at Thomas Cooper Library. The two floods of 1988-89 showed this to be necessary.

1988/89 was an important year for special collections acquisitions at Thomas Cooper Library, including the following collections which were inaugurated or acquired during the year:

1. G. Ross Roy Collection of Burnsiana and Scottish literature
2. Thomas Carlyle Collection
3. Modern Literature Collection

B. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULA AND COURSES

Professor Richard Bell for Robert Castleberry: The committee is meeting for the first time this year today at 2:00 p.m. Therefore, all actions taken by the committee this summer have already been processed through the USC-Columbia Faculty Senate and have been noted in the published minutes of that body. Please recall that committee actions are not final until approved by the Faculty Senate.

C. UNIVERSITY FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Professor Charles Cook reporting for Don Curlovic: The committee has not met.

D. ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Professor Bruce Nims: The committee has not met.

E. FACULTY/BOARD OF TRUSTEES LIAISON COMMITTEE

Professor Rod Sproatt: This committee met on Thursday, September 14, in the Osborne Administration Building.

Three new degree programs were approved: M.A.T. in Special Education (USC Columbia); B.A. in Dramatic Arts (USC Coastal); B.S.I.S. (USC Coastal, Myrtle Beach Air Force Base).

There was approved a change in PAT regulations at USC Spartanburg.

Representative Mike Fair provided additional information in the form of a video tape, concerning his reasons for wanting a written policy concerning the regulation of performances that minors may attend on USC campuses. (See Attachment A.)

Professor Gunther T. Holst presented a unanimous resolution (Attachment B) from the Columbia Senate stating the reasons why that body does not support Representative Fair's proposal. The president of the USC Columbia Student Senate presented a similar resolution (Attachment C) expressing the same reservations about Representative Fair's proposal.

The Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee passed a motion (Attachment D) to recommend to the Board of Trustees that the University reaffirm its commitment to the policies set forth in South Carolina's "Harmful to Minors Act" and continue to vigorously seek enforcement of that act on University premises. It is the intention of the committee that this action would end this matter.

Provost Smith presented a report on the status of new programs in the system (Attachment E). Dr. Duffy: I take this matter very seriously. It is and has been a recurring problem by well-meaning folks. However, faculty should be concerned; these matters could well impinge upon academic freedom.

F . RESEARCH AND PRODUCTIVE SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE

Professor Tandy Willis

There was no report from this committee as Professor Willis could not be here today.

G. SAVANNAH RIVER SITE COMMITTEE

Professor W. O. Lamprecht, Jr.: Committee has not met; no report.

H. SYSTEM ACADEMIC POLICY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Professor Robert Costello: The System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee last met on April 19, 1989; a report of that meeting was presented at the April 21, 1989, meeting of this Senate. The Committee is scheduled to meet this afternoon, Friday, September 15, 1989, to consider agenda topics for this academic year. The University Campuses are represented by Vice Chancellor John Gardner, Faculty Senate Chair Deborah Cureton, and Dr. Robert Costello, any of whom will communicate your concerns to the Committee. Since University Campuses input regarding articulation problems within the System provided major input for the establishment of this Committee, it is to be hoped that we will make full use of it as a vehicle for communicating both our perceptions of problems and for expressing our visions of a greater University System.

Dr. Duffy: We must act on the catalog enforcement problem, possibly at our next Senate meeting. We need to adopt or act on this as a body. There are problems particularly with students moving among the University Campuses. We believe that the learning center concept will help out in this problem area. Some campuses are seeking AACSB accreditation, namely Spartanburg, and this process of a campus coming under the guidelines for accreditation has resulted in this catalog enforcement problem. As regards CHE, which is more of a concern on our campuses, assessment reports will come from all campuses. These reports will be forwarded and acted upon by the Board of Trustees and then passed on to the Commission (of Higher Education). So much of what we do academically is justified by our (University) infrastructure, the learning centers, electronic and computer technologies, GRS, continuing education, etc. The CHE needs to see how higher education has changed. We are on top of this issue and we are not going to back off.

I. OTHER COMMITTEES

(1) Insurance and Annuities Committee

Professor ferry Dockery: The University Campuses have been given representation on this committee effective fall 1989. The committee reviews and responds to requests from insurance companies for the University's endorsement and/or approval for their plans to be **authorized for the** University's payroll deduction system. Existing University insurance programs are reviewed and updated as appropriate, through the development of new plans or the revision of existing plans.

The Committee has not met this year but has developed specifications to invite new bids for the Disability Income Insurance. The bids process will be initiated in fall 1989.

Professor Dockery then spoke informally about changes in our current insurance coverage and how important it is to realize that current employees of the University will not be covered with insurance protection if they do not re-enroll by October 31.

(2) Affirmative Action Committee

Professor Deborah Cureton: The Affirmative Action Committee held a luncheon meeting at the Faculty House on June 21, 1989. The primary purpose of this meeting was to express our appreciation for her services (and our regret at losing her) to Paula Cox, former System Affirmative Action Officer, whose resignation was effective this summer. This was also an opportunity to hear from Mrs. Cox her reflections on the System's affirmative action progress or lack thereof and some suggested directions and recommendations for the future.

Mrs. Cox's address to the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee appears as an attachment to these minutes.

Professor Gardner, Chair, Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, informed the members that the search for a new System Affirmative Action Officer is in progress.

VII UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was none.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Professor Dockery: Just a reminder of the PC users meeting at USC Sumter, Friday, October 6, in the computer lab.

Dr. Duffy: Our reception immediately follows in Capstone.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The Senate was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rick D. Boulware
Scribe

Attachments: UCFS Membership for 1989/1990
Written report of Chancellor Duffy
Written report of Vice Chancellor Gardner
Resolution from the System Affairs Committee
Resolution from the Executive Committee
Attachments A - E from Bd. of Trustees meeting
Affirmative Action report

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
MEMBERSHIP FOR 1989/1990

Senators from USC Beaufort:

John Blair, Ellen Chamberlain, Gordon Haist, Rod Sproatt, Jane Upshaw, Rick Boulware
(Executive Committee)

Senators from USC Lancaster:

Noni Bohonak, John Catalano, Wade Chittam, Danny Faulkner, Bruce Nims, Wayne
Thurman, Deborah Cureton (Executive Committee)

Senators from Lifelong Learning:

Dave Bowden, Steve Dalton, Jerry Dockery, Linda Holderfield, John Stine, Nancy
Washington (Executive Committee)

Senators from USC Salkehatchie:

Milton Harden, Susan Moskow, Paul Stone, Sandra Willis, Ali Pyarali (Executive
Committee)

Senators from USC Sumter:

Richard Bell, Robert Castleberry, Charles Cook, John Logue, Nancy McDonald, Kay
Oldhouser, Haas Raval, John Safford, Carolyn West (Executive Committee)

Senators from USC Union:

Mary Barton, Susan Smith, Tandy Willis, Greg Labyak (Executive Committee)

REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR
FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND Continuing EDUCATION
FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
September 15, 19B9

This report will bring you up to date on items which I think will be of interest to all faculty.

TEC Proposals

The TEC Proposal to establish college parallel associate arts and associate science degree programs at all their campuses will be considered by the Commission in November. I urge all of you to contact appropriate people to express our dismay at this development. The duplication of effort, which would result if that proposal is approved, is, I think, obvious.

Future of BAIS

John Gardner and I have had conversations with Dean Varney about the BAIS program. We plan ask for formal approval of the existing mechanism for the BAIS from the Commission next Year. Dean Varney has indicated to us his willingness to work with us to meet the needs of the people in the respective areas which we serve.

TEC/USC Super Committee

We are in the process of forming a committee of representatives from TEC and USC which would be in position to iron out potential areas of conflict before they reach the point that they would have to be decided by the either the Legislature or the Commission.

President's Visits to University Campuses

The President visited Sumter, met informally with faculty, students, and community leaders of the Sumter area. It is his intention to visit all campuses in the System in a similar fashion this year.

Faculty Salaries

As I indicated to you, it was our intent to give faculty more than the State raise of 3 percent. I am pleased that at the university Campuses, we have been able to do so.

Academic Freedom Issue of Mike Fair

The Executive Committee has reprised you of Representative Mike Fair's proposal that USC ban the attendance of minors at affairs which Representative Fair deems obscene. I trust that the faculty will see the threat that such a proposal would raise to the academic community.

Kirsh Committee

Recently, the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, chaired by Representative Herb Kirsh, including Representative James W. Johnson and Representative Jarvis Kapman visited all of our campuses as part of a visit to all educational institutions in the state. These visits went quite well. Our Deans and their administrators did a very fine job of presenting our needs to the Legislative Committee.

The Self-Study will be addressed by Jim Edwards, and the Librarians' Retreat will be discussed by Linda Allman.

REPORT OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR
FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
September 15, 1989

CHE Off-campus Programs Review

As you may recall, the university has been having discussions with the Commission on Higher Education since December 1987 on the status of the University Campuses off-campus programs in Laurens, Hilton Head, Camden and Walterboro; in addition, Aiken and Coastal programs at Sumter, Beaufort, Salkehatchie. The status of these program reviews currently is that they have all been "informally" reviewed by the CHE staff, who have sent written counsel to us for the revision of these proposals. These proposals, with the exception of the Coastal-Sumter Education program, will be submitted to the USC Board of Trustees at the October 20th meeting and then will be forwarded to the Commission by its November 1 deadline. Then they will be formally reviewed in the next six month Commission review cycle and will be acted upon at the May 1990 meeting of the Commission. At this point, we are optimistic that they will all be approved.

System Academic Coordinating Committee

This is a committee that Provost Art Smith appointed last spring and consists of the chief academic officer, the faculty senate chairs, and a faculty representative from the three four-year campuses, USC-Columbia, and the University Campuses. The committee is holding its second meeting the very hour the Senate meets. Hence, I cannot report to you on what action it may take. I attach to this report a copy of the action taken by the committee at its meeting last spring, which has significance for our concerns for student articulation as they move from university Campuses to Four-Year Campuses.

USC-Lancaster Retreat

I had the privilege in August of attending the USC-Lancaster Retreat and I came away from that experience further persuaded as to the merits of gathering faculty and administrators together for some kind of annual campus retreat. It is an outstanding idea that enables colleagues to focus together on a number of common issues and concerns, explore topics in depth, get to know each other even better, and develop a consensus as to objectives for the coming Year. I strongly recommend colleagues on the four campuses other than Lancaster to consider the model that they have seemed to use so successfully for a number of years.

Faculty Development Needs Assessment Committee

The Provost's Office and the Office of the Chancellor are convening a committee (on which I represent the university Campuses) which will attempt to do a needs assessment of faculty on our six campuses for faculty development and support. I will be in touch with you further over the year as the work of that committee progresses.

Affirmative Action

I am currently serving as the chair of the search committee to find a new Affirmative Action Officer for the university System. Our System Campus Affirmative Action Officers are meeting each of the candidates we are interviewing. The General Assembly has also taken a recent action which will provide significant impetus to our previous moral and philosophical commitment to the practice of affirmative action. Specifically, state agencies who do not meet affirmative action hiring plan goals could be penalized in future years by being denied additional appropriated funding, if they cannot demonstrate that good faith efforts have been made to address these goals. We on the University Campuses have the highest percentage of minority students enrolled anywhere in the System, but we still have a long, long way to go to accomplish greater diversity in our faculty and staff. I am sure you will join the Office of the Chancellor in supporting such efforts as you work on searches and other hiring recruitment matters over the coming year.

Risk Manager Position

In June, the university hired for the first time a professional Risk Manager, Mr. Shealy McCoy, who was previously Risk Manager for Georgia State University in Atlanta. This is a major step forward for the university in joining now the ranks of other major institutions that have professionalize their approach to identification of risk exposures and management of same. Mr. McCoy is visiting all the University Campuses to discuss the subject of risk management with campus officials and I am sure we will enjoy your support and cooperation. I believe that the efforts of his office will make contributions to the maintenance of safety and security for our students and employees and that you will enjoy working with him.

Symposium on Retention

On Friday, October 6th, the National Center for the Study of the Freshman Year Experience will co-host a symposium on student retention. The keynote speaker will be Dr. Vincent Tinto, the noted researcher and author on the subject of student retention. If you would like further information on this meeting which will be held in Columbia at the Sheraton on Bush River Road please contact me or Dorothy Fidler at 7-6029.

Articulation Problems with USC-Spartanburg

I want you to know that Provost Smith has given the University Campuses a strong measure of support in attempting to redress problems encountered by a USC-Lancaster student as she sought to articulate from USC-Lancaster to USC-Spartanburg. That matter is as yet unresolved, but we shall keep the Senate informed of the problem in particular and the larger issue which it represents. I wanted to say at this point, that we are enjoying strong support from the Provost to resolve these kind of issues with the student welfare foremost in mind.

Faculty Exchange

Shortly, you will receive the annual applications for the Faculty Exchange program. We will be working this Year with the Provost's Office to review these applications and make recommendations to the President and the Provost. If you have questions please don't hesitate to discuss them with me. I sincerely hope the university Campuses faculty will again be active participants in this program.

Fall 1989 Enrollments

See attachment.

John J. Duffy Distance Education Lecture Series

This is to announce the inauguration of an annual lecture series entitled the John J. Duffy Lecture Series. The purpose of this series is to encourage research in the area of distance education and to reinforce the mission of the University of South Carolina System to overcome barriers of time and place in making higher education accessible to learners worldwide. The series is sponsored by the College of Library and Information Science and our own Office of Telecommunications Instruction and Independent Learning. Chancellor Duffy will deliver the first address on September 25, 1989 at 3:00 pm in Currell College at USC-Columbia. You are all cordially invited to attend. The lecture will be followed by a reception at Faculty House. We will also recognize John on this occasion for his 30 years of service to the University of South Carolina System.

Status of TEC Associate Degree Proposals

At the November meeting of the Commission on Higher Education, there will be considered a proposal from nine of the state's sixteen technical colleges, those who currently do not have college parallel associate degree granting authorization, to award such degrees. The President, at the System Retreat in August, "encouraged" the Deans of the university to launch an extensive "education" campaign to present the university's view in opposing these proposals in our respective communities. Your individual Deans are the appropriate persons to inform you as to the steps they have taken towards this end.

Enclosures: Provost's memorandum of June 14, 1989

Fall 1989 Semester Enrollment Report

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND PROVOST

Memorandum:

June 14, 1989

To: Dr. Rufus G. Fellers, Chair, USC-Columbia Faculty Senate
From: Arthur K. Smith, Provost
Subject: Bulletin Requirements for Graduation

As you know, Rufus, there has been a growing need for clarification of the university's policies governing degree requirements for graduation that apply to students who move from one degree program to another on the same campus, or from one campus to another within the USC System.

This problem was referred several months ago by the newly formed System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee. This Committee, as its name implies, has no legislative authority of its own, but I formed it to coordinate academic policy matters of the nine campuses and five faculty Senates when such matters affect the USC System as a whole. The System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee consists of 15 members, as follows:

The five chief academic officers of the campuses at Aiken, Coastal Carolina, Columbia, and Spartanburg, and of the five university Campuses (as a group).

The chairpersons of the five faculty senates.

Five additional faculty members, each one chosen by the chief academic officer and the faculty senate chairperson from the respective campus or group of campuses.

The Committee is chaired by me as Provost of the university, and is advisory to the President, who consults with the four Chancellors regarding the Committee's recommendations on system academic policy matters before taking action on them.

The System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee considered the graduation degree requirements issue at its meeting on April 19. The Committee agreed that policy clarification was indeed required, both to uphold the integrity of the USC System and to align the system policy statement on graduation requirements with prevailing judicial interpretations of education law. As background, prior to 1982 the USC System had in place a policy statement that accomplished both objectives. However, in 1982 a revision was introduced in the USC-Columbia undergraduate Bulletin that substantially changed the system policy. That revision has resulted in confusion for students, inconsistency in academic advising, and possible legal exposure for the University with respect to the contractual nature of the Bulletin. Moreover, it appears that the

1982 revision was made by administrative action in editing the Bulletin, rather than by action of the USC-Columbia Faculty Senate.

The Coordinating Committee subsequently approved a new policy statement for the USC System and recommended that statement for consideration by President James B. Holderman. In effect, the recommended policy is a return to the pre-1982 policy governing graduation degree requirements, and thus reverts to the general policy most recently approved by the faculty. The President has now approved the Committee's recommended policy statement, which is as follows:

An undergraduate student may choose to obtain a degree in accordance with the curricular requirements in force for the particular degree at the time the student first enrolls in matriculated status at any campus of the University System, or under subsequent requirements published while he or she is enrolled. However, the student's choice is restricted to a specific bulletin the curricular requirements described therein. Undergraduate student have a period of eight years, inclusive and continuous, in which to claim the rights of a specific bulletin.

Within the eight-year limit, an undergraduate to student who is absent from the university System for no longer than five years, who returns to complete his or her program of study, shall have the right to continue under the bulletin in effect at the time of the student's original matriculation. Alternatively, the student may elect the degree requirements under the bulletin in effect at the time of return. If the period of absence is longer than five years, the student will be subject to the curricular requirements in force at the time of return. Under no circumstances will students be allowed to appeal to short-lived rules regulations which were adopted and abandoned during the period of their absence.

If drastic revisions of curricula or program requirements have occurred during a student's absence (even if for less than five years), or during the period between the student's original matriculation his or her eventual movement to a different degree program or campus within the University System, a reasonable effort will be made by the academic dean to permit the student to undertake transitional coursework that is equivalent to the educational experience intended under the bulletin in force at the time of the student's original matriculation.

The Committee expressed concern that the five year period of allowed absence seems extraordinarily generous, and a er of members felt that a two year limitation on absences would be more appropriate. However, the Committee recognized that a substantive change of this nature should emanate from a joint action of the several faculty senates, rather than from a coordinating committee.

To the extent that publishing deadlines permit, the above policy statement should be inserted in the 1989-90 undergraduate bulletins of the several campuses of the USC System. All currently enrolled undergraduate students should be accorded the benefit of this policy.

While it is not clear whether Action by the USC-Columbia Faculty Senate is needed in order to effect this return to the pre-1982 policy, such action is certainly desirable in the interest of good governance I would be grateful, Rufus, if you would Ask the Steering Committee to consider this item for inclusion in the Faculty Senate agenda for the meeting of July 6, 1989

AKS/ehg

cc President James B. Holderman
Chancellor Robert E Alexander
Chancellor John J. Daffy
Chancellor Ronald G. Eaglin
Chancellor 011n B. Sansbury
Members of the Academic Policy
Coordinating Committee

*Doctoret:

Co[umbin 1,Z40 1,Z73

GRS 235 Z49

'lote[Grad.:

Co[umbis 3,B62 4,012 3.9

GRS 927 922 -.5

" F.1.E. Divisors used:

u/G = 15 DPMR = 15 ~, Inctudes Corresp. and Lete GRS F1E:

Lsw = 14 Msst.= 12 1988 Oct. ~(+ 1988)

"-' Doct.= 9 (Cots.:) Corr. Diff. Corr. F 11/GRS

SOURCE: E61 Matrix Program.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research u/G : 205 354 Z11

343

M^ST.: Z6Z Z29

cd 9/14/BO DOC1.: 71 65

(^udit F1E's e, ctuded: 7g - 91)

RESOLUTION FROM THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
CONCERNING A PROPOSAL BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA TECHNICAL EDUCATION
SYSTEM THAT ALL TECHNICAL SCHOOLS BE ALLOWED TO OFFER COLLEGE
PARALLEL PROGRAMS --adopted by the University Campuses Faculty Senate at its
September 15, 1989, meeting

WHEREAS the South Carolina Technical Education System has requested that all their
campuses be allowed to offer college parallel programs, and

WHEREAS many of these technical education schools are in close proximity to university
campuses of the University of South Carolina which already offer these college programs (USC-
Beaufort, USC-Lancaster, USC-Salkehatchie, USC-Sumter, USC-Union, USC-Coastal Carolina
College, USC-Aiken, and USC-Spartanburg), and

WHEREAS it is counter-productive to higher education needs in South Carolina to expand the
Technical Education System in this manner since to duplicate these course offerings would be
unnecessary and administratively cumbersome, and since this duplication would mean
substantially increased costs to South Carolina in order to bring the Technical Education System
up to accreditation standards, and

WHEREAS the university campuses of the University of South Carolina are already fully
accredited, and

WHEREAS the university campuses already have in place the mechanisms to support traditional,
non-traditional, minority, Add adult student bodies, and

WHEREAS the university campuses have strong evidence that these student populations are
being well-served by them,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the university campuses of the University of South Carolina wish to
continue their valuable service to the citizens of South Carolina and to follow their historical
missions as they have done for the past thirty years, and

THAT the university campuses of the University of South Carolina oppose the expanded offering
of college parallel courses at the technical education schools, and

THAT the university campuses of the University of South Carolina urge representatives from the
Technical Education System and the USC System to form an ad hoc committee to settle this
issue before the proposal for expanded course offerings from the Technical Education System
reaches a decision by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education.

RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY POLICY CONCERNING PROPOSALS FROM
REPRESENTATIVE MIKE FAIR --passed unanimously by the University Campuses Faculty
Senate at its September 15, 1989, meeting

WHEREAS the State of South Carolina has enacted legislation protecting minors from obscene
material, and

WHEREAS the University of South Carolina complies with the laws of the State,

BE IT RESOLVED that the faculties of the University Campuses of the University of South
Carolina oppose the imposition of a separate and special policy on University activities.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Representative Mike Fair

FROM: Moses Boyd

DATE: August 10, 1989

RE: Policy Proposal for the Establishment of Guidelines for the Admission of Minors at Certain Dramatical and Theatrical Performances at the University of South Carolina

A POLICY GUIDELINE PROVIDING FOR THE REGULATION OF THE ADMISSION OF MINORS AT CERTAIN DRAMATICAL AND THEATRICAL PERFORMANCES, DEFINING THE TYPES OF ACTS THAT ARE CONSIDERED HARMFUL TO MINORS AND OTHER REOUIREMEHTS FOR PERSONS CONDUCTING. SPONSORING, AND SUPERVISING SUCH ACTIVITIES.

Whereas, the University of South Carolina is widely known for its support and promotion of the theatrical arts in the State of South Carolina; and

Whereas, the University regularly features and sponsors many theatrical activities through public forums, plays, and other works of drama for the benefit of its faculty, student body, and the general public; and

Whereas, the purpose of the University's activities are not only to advance the arts, but also to use theatre and drama as mechanisms to expose its faculty, student body, and the public to different ideas and forms of expressions; and

Whereas, the University is aware, that the presentation and exposition of different ideas and forms of human behavior and expression are important for the education and development of its student body and the attending public; and

Whereas the University understands however, that because it has adopted s policy of allowing its faculty, student body, and the participating public to freely express themselves through theater and dramas, that at times these performances may include acts that are designed for adult and mature audiences only; and

Whereas, the University understands that activities that include certain expressions of sexuality and vulgarity may beyond the capacity to serve as any artistic literary or social value to the development and education of minors; and

Whereas, the General Assembly has enacted certain statutory provisions regulating and prohibiting the use and the exposition of minors to certain acts and performances that are considered harmful to or beyond the maturity level of minors; and

Whereas, it is the University's intention to fully comply with and adhere to the laws of this State; and

Whereas, although the University understands the importance of allowing its students and faculty to freely express themselves in their works of art and speech, it has the duty under the laws of this State and the policies and principles of this institution to ensure that none of its activities violate the physical, mental, and moral health and safety of its student body, faculty, and the general public; and

Whereas, the University -understands that the citizens of this State place a special importance on the protection and preservation of the physical and moral safety and health of minors, and therefore will ensure that its policies and functions are consistent with the concerns and interest of the citizens of the State and its supporting community; and

Whereas, since the University is only interested in promoting activities that serve to advance the normal maturation and mental development of minors, it feels it necessary to provide certain regulations of its public performances so as to protect and preserve the moral integrity of the youth of this State. Now, therefore:

Be it adopted by the University of South Carolina.

SECTION 1. The University of South Carolina is adopting this policy guideline to ensure the protection of minors from any of its theatrical and dramatical performances or activities that are considered harmful to or beyond the maturity level of minors. In adopting the measures in this guideline, the University has attempted to be consistent with the laws of this State and

the general consensus on what is considered to be harmful or beyond the maturity level of minors. The University will require strict compliance with this policy guideline.

SECTION 2. As used in this policy statement:

(1) "Performance harmful to a minor" means a performance which contains a description of or explicit reference to:

- (a) anal copulation;
- (b) bestial sexual relations;
- (c) sadistic, masochistic, or violent sexual relationships;
- (d) sexual relations with a child;
- (e) sexual relations with a corpse;
- (f) exhibition of male or female genitals;
- (g) rape or incest; or
- (h) vulgar or indecent reference to sexual intercourse, excretory functions of the body, or male or female genitals; and which, taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest of minors in sex and violates generally prevailing standard, in the adult community as to the suitability of such performances for observation of a minor and lacks any serious, artistic, literary, political, or scientific merit as to a minor and any other matter that would be considered harmful to minors pursuant to the laws of this State.

(2) "Control over University-owned facilities" means any person or employee of the person authorized by lease to produce, direct, participate in or perform any musical, dramatic, or theatrical performance at a University-owned facility. This term does not include peace officers in performance of their official duties.

(3) "Person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, or other legal entity of any kind.

(a) "Leased area" includes that area of a university-owned facility identified by lease providing for performance of a musical, dramatic, or theatrical production.

(S) "Minor" means a person under the age of eighteen.

(6) "Produce" means contractual responsibility for advertising, staging, or setting up a musical, dramatic, or theatrical production.

(7) "Perform" means acting or performing musical, dramatic, or theatrical production.

(8) "Direct" means commanding movement of any actor, performer, stage equipment, or stage props.

(9) "Participate" means piecing or moving equipment or props used in a musical, dramatic, or theatrical production.

(10) "Theatrical performance" means any musical, dramatic, or theatrical production including, but not limited to, any play, public forum, musical concert, etc., performed by any individual or identifiable group whether or not the production includes more than one individual or identifiable group staged in a University-owned facility.

(11) "Explicit reference" means the use of words which have a readily recognizable meaning describing or depicting conduct proscribed in this statement, but does not include words which are marshy suggestive or have meanings which are equally consistent with actions not proscribed in this policy statement.

SECTION 3. No person having control over University-owned facility shall intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly allow or permit a minor to enter or to remain within a leased area in a University-owned facility at any time during a University authorized or sponsored theatrical performance, if the person knows, or has knowledge of sufficient facts and circumstances from which a reasonable person would know that the performance is or may be a performance harmful as to a minor.

SECTION 4. No person shall intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly produce, perform, direct, or participate in a performance within the leased area if the person knows or has knowledge of sufficient facts and circumstances from which a reasonable person could know that a minor is present so that the performance is or may be a performance harmful as to a minor.

SECTION 5. A person who produces or directs a performance, and who knows, or has knowledge of facts and circumstances from which a reasonable person would know that the performance is or may be a performance harmful to a minor shall place the following notice in any advertisement or publication of the performances: "For persons eighteen or older only. I.D. will be required."

SECTION 6. NO person shall intentionally or knowingly aid or assist a minor in gaining admission to, or in remaining present during a performance which the person knows or had knowledge of facts and circumstances from which a reasonable person would know that the performance is or may be a performance harmful to a minor.

SECTION 7. It is an affirmative defense to any punishable action pursuant to provisions of Sections 3 and 4 if the person having control over a University-owned facility attempts to ascertain the true age of a minor seeking entrance to a performance harmful as to a minor by requiring production of a birth certificate, school record, including identification showing or indicating that the person is eighteen or older.

SECTION 8. Each act or failure to act as required by this policy guide may result in the termination and restriction of employment and participation with the University's theatrical activities.

SECTION 9. The requirements of this policy statement apply only to leases providing for performances of theatrical or dramatic productions in University-owned facilities executed after the official adoption of this policy statement.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this day of August, 1989.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA, SC 29208
UNIVERSITY OF THE UNIVERSITY
PHONE: 777-6073

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. William L. Bethea, Jr. Chairman
Academic Affairs Committee, Board of Trustees
FROM: Faculty-Board of Trustees Liaison Committee
RE: "Policy Proposal for the Establishment of Guidelines
for the Admission of Minors at Certain Dramatical and
Theatrical Performances at the university of South
Carolina"
DATE: September 11, 1989

The Provost has transmitted to us your request for faculty advice regarding the captioned proposal.

We offer the following observations:

1. The proposal is generally based on South Carolina Code Sections 16-15-305 to -445, a new statute, enacted in 1987, dealing with "Obscenity, Material Harmful to Minors, Child Exploitation, and Child Prostitution." University employees are already charged with knowledge of state law.
2. To the extent that the proposal wanders from the language of the statute, it may risk attack for possible unconstitutional overbreadth or unconstitutional prior restraint on expression. University employees should be able to rely on existing law and not be required to enforce policies that may be unconstitutional.
3. Section 9 of the proposal states that the proposed policy applies "only to leases providing for performances of theatrical or dramatic productions in university-owned facilities." Thus, it purports to regulate only non-university productions.

Abe Un[~ersEly of Sculh CeroI[na USC ^iken; USC Selkehalchie, Allendele; USC Besu10rl USC CoIumbla; Cons1aI CeroRna College Conway USC Lencasler USC Sperlenbu[g USC Sumter USC Union and the ~.n`.v Compus

Mr. William L. Bethea, Jr.
September 11, 1989
Page Two

4. Section 7 of the proposal, however, in addition to criminal sanctions provided by State law, adds the academic sanctions of "termination and restriction of employment and participation with the University's theatrical activities.

5. The proposal is addressed to any "person having control over a university-owned facility" (Section 3), any "person who shall ... produce, perform, direct, or participate in a performance within the leased area" (Section 4), any person "who produces or directs a performance" (Section 5), and any person "[who] shall ... aid or assist a minor in gaining admission to, or in remaining present during a performance" (section 6).

6. It is clear that the persons covered by sections 3-6 may not all be university employees and that such persons cannot be subjected to all the sanctions of Section 7. Contrariwise, Sections 3-7 cover all university employees, from, for example, ticket takers to the director of a university owned facility. The university already has standards and procedures for disciplining its employees.

We therefore recommend:

1. To the extent that the proposal tracks current state law, it should be declined as unnecessary.
2. To the extent that the proposal wanders from current state law, it should be declined as inviting unnecessary judicial review.
3. To the extent that the proposal duplicates established university standards for the termination and discipline of its employees (without, it may be noted, establishing or referring to any procedures), it should be declined as redundant.

We note further that the Columbia Faculty at its meeting on September 6, 1989, passed a resolution regarding the proposal. A copy is attached.

Gunther J. Hoist
For the Committee

- RESOLUTION ON POLICY PROPOSAL

WHEREAS the General Assembly has already enacted statutory provisions pertaining to the protection of minors from obscene material and

WHEREAS these provisions apply generally in the State of South Carolina and

WHEREAS The university is already bound to comply with the laws of the State

BE IT RESOLVED that the faculty of The university of South Carolina strongly objects to the imposition of a separate and special policy on university activities.

[Passed unanimously by the Columbia Faculty on September 6, 1989,

.
-.

SBL(89)01 8
September 12, 1989
Senator Cameron Rader, on behalf of Student Body President Wade-Louisa A.
Ramsdale, proposes:

A RESOLUTION

WHEREAS: The General Assembly hereby amend S1-U10 provisions pertaining to the
prohibition of minimum obscene material and

WHEREAS: These provisions apply generally in the State of South Carolina, and
WHEREAS: The University is bound to comply with the laws of the State,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Student Senate, acting on behalf of the students of the
University of South Carolina, strongly opposes the imposition of a curfew and special policy
on University activity

...
John - President of the Senate
Dad

~ ~

I move that the Committee recommend to the Board of Trustees that the University reaffirm its commitment to the policies set forth in South Carolina's "Harmful to minors Act" and continue rigorously to seek enforcement of that act on university premises.

~ ~{

New Degree Programs 1988-89

Enrollment

Program Year 1 Budget 1988-89 Expenditures Fall 88 Spring 89

Cot 1a

MA Religious Studies	18,000	18,000 - CIA's	20	13
B^ Contemporary	0	0	0	0
European Studies				
<u>Constn1</u>				
s				
B^ Sociology	28,200	28,000 - Focally	8	ID
	600 - Support	~ Travel		
	500 - LLbr~ry			
BA Studio Art	151,596	10,000 - FaculLy	14	24
	600 - Support	~ Travel		
	3,000 - Library			
	240,000 - Bldg. renovation			
<u>S' }nct~ll)ur</u>				
BS Mnlhemncle	~700	5,100 - Llbrnry	2	

@

uNIVERSITY OF BOuTH C^ROLIN^

Ad INCH

POSTOFFICEBOX370

LANCASTER,SOUTHCAROLINA29720

(B03)2S~7471

{Bos)777-eB77

age Muon ~ C~ee Upon

C_u~s ~- Serge gem

S~_er 15, lose

me ~e gum ala Co_~ee bad a Inched Beam ~ me Facula House on

Jung 21,1gSg. Ibe plenary purpose of this insets gas to Express our appreciation for her seances (ad our gut ~ lost bed to Paula Con, aver gem ~- action Omcer, ose Scion Has enacts tab summer ~ was also ~ oppodu~ to bear ~= Bra

Con her resections on the Esteem atone action progress or lack thereof and some summered dragons _ ~c_end~io~ for the Stun.

airs. Cons address to the ague action ^so~ C~ee ~ ached.

Professor Gardner Cba~, ague action ^so~ Co_~e~ aged the meows ~e~-a_~_mp~.

The Unitary ~ Sough Carohna: USC then: **USC SaI~halch~, ^l~nda~; USC butt; USC Crumble Cast Carohna CoMege, Conway: USC ~ncasler; USC Sparlanburg; USC Sumler; USC Un[on; and lhe are Campus.**

.: %.

Affirmative Action Advisory Committee

University Campuses Faculty Senate Meeting

September 15, 1989

The Affirmative Action Advisory Committee held a luncheon meeting at the Faculty House on June 21, 1989. The primary purpose of this meeting was to express our appreciation for her services (and our regret at losing her) to Paula Cox, former System Affirmative Action Officer, whose resignation was effective this summer. This was also an opportunity to hear from Mrs. Cox her reflections on the System's affirmative action progress or lack thereof and some suggested directions and recommendations for the future.

Mrs. Cox's address to the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee is attached.

Professor Gardner, Chair, Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, informed the members that the search for a new System Affirmative Action Officer is in progress.

Address to the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee
By Paula N. Cox, USC System Affirmative Action Officer
On the Occasion of Employment Termination
June 21, 1989

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for inviting me to present a personal assessment of the progress of affirmative action at the University of South Carolina. I will close my remarks with recommendations as to future directions necessary to enhance the institution's image as an affirmative action/ equal opportunity employer and educational institution.

THE GOAL

Work force statistics indicate whether the goals of affirmative action are being attained. The bottom line is the actual results of efforts to hire and promote those protected classes for whom we are required by law to take affirmative action: minorities (specifically Blacks in South Carolina), women, handicapped individuals, disabled veterans and Vietnam era Veterans. Of these groups, actual numerical hiring goals are projected for Blacks and women. Granted, they are goals, not quotas; therefore the institution is not held to goal achievement if it can demonstrate that a reasonable effort was made in good faith to achieve these goals. But progress in achieving the diversity which is so essential to the vitality of the academic environment hinges directly on meeting the institution's affirmative action goals. And regulatory agencies begin to question "good faith" efforts that produce no significant change to the status quo. We must take affirmative action to eliminate the underrepresentation of protected class members at all levels of the institution's work force if we are ever to achieve that stage at which we can truly claim to be an equal opportunity employer and educational institution.

THE PROGRESS

The first Affirmative Action Officer at USC, Anna S. Durham, was appointed on December 1, 1972. We are now nearing the end of two decades of affirmative action at USC. What do the figures tell us about our progress in affirmative action? White females in tenure eligible ranks on the Columbia campus rose from 19% in 1975 to 23% in 1988. When all faculty levels are considered, the figure for White females on the Columbia campus is currently 25%. Minority males in tenure eligible faculty ranks increased from 3% in 1975 to 5% in 1988 while minority females remained at 1% over the past 14 years. Looking specifically at Blacks on the USC-Columbia faculty we see that they currently comprise 2%, of the tenure eligible ranks and 3, when all faculty levels are taken as a whole. In sum, current statistics for Columbia campus faculty indicate that White females comprise 25%, Blacks, male and female 3%, other minorities 4% and white males 69%. System totals show Black faculty at 3% and women faculty at 30%; actually, a 70%~/30%, male/female faculty split.

Over the Years we have had modest increases in deanships held by women, in the appointment of women at the vice presidential level, and two Black gales have been appointed as vice presidents though only one held office at this rank at a time.

Among the classified employees on the Columbia Campus, as of Fall 1988, 87.5% of the persons earning over \$40,000 annually were White males, 4% Blacks, 1% other minorities and 6% White females. These figures are almost reversed at the lowest grade levels. At grades ID to 15, we find that 89% of the employees are Black, White females 4% and White males 7%. Between grades 10 to 20 there is a 70% female 30% male split in the share of these positions. A marked improvement is noted in the middle grades of 20 to 30 with women holding 56% of these jobs and men 44%. Then at the top, over grade 30, there is a reversal of the situation at the lower grade levels, men have a 70% share of these jobs and women a 30% share.

There is no denying that there has been some progress in work force composition for both staff and faculty by race and gender. But this progress has been painfully slow, very modest in scope and not as consistent as it could be. Women are joining the work force in increasing numbers but their upward mobility needs to accelerate. Blacks, on the other hand, often do not appear to be even making it to first base, despite their representation in applicant pools. Blacks are still having some difficulty gaining access, let alone upward mobility. A small group of individuals strive to make a difference, but there does not appear to be an across-the-board commitment to give priority consideration to affirmative action. It has taken us twenty Years to reach this far; we need to accelerate the progress. Affirmative Action is intended to be temporary. There will be no need for affirmative action goals when the underutilization of women and minorities is eliminated.

THE BARRIERS

The Affirmative Action Officer does not have the authority to make or influence any personnel decisions such as hiring, promoting, terminating, or the like, except when it directly relates to the staff of the Affirmative Action Office. These employment decisions are made by individual University officials, and until these persons are held accountable for their actions, and until they understand and experience the consequences of their decisions, then there will be no significant change much less accelerated change to the work force composition. The main barriers to improving the affirmative action **profile of** this institution are: lack of knowledge, indifference, resistance, denial, and lack of broad-based commitment and an absence of accountability measures.

Within the limits of our staff and budget the affirmative action office attempts to inform the University Community as to the requirements, roles and responsibilities related to affirmative action and equal employment opportunity. But this needs to be a constant education and training process which is integrated into general University staff training and faculty development offerings.

Indifference is a direct consequence of the absence of accountability. There are policies and procedures which allow for the performance evaluation of supervisors to include an assessment of their efforts at promoting affirmative action and equal opportunity. The Provost may require deans to justify ~ their selection before approving a request to make an offer. But I do not know the extent to which these procedures are enforced and/or are linked to some measure of reward or censure.

When EEO became law a quarter century ago, it ushered in a new order. But attitudes and practices die hard. They are not easily legislated away. So there are pockets of resistance, often subtle. And although this resistance can be worn away with time, how much more time should we allow? We do not have the luxury of time if we are to prepare the work force for the year 2001.

Denial impedes progress in eliminating racism and sexism. We cannot admit that there are one or two problem supervisors without recognizing the negative impact they could have on our public image. When racism and/or sexism exists in any unit or department in this institution, it taints the entire University System. We must strive to educate and sensitize the University Community to the principles of equality and we must strive to nurture an acceptance of cultural differences. We all have prejudices, but when we act on our prejudices in a manner which demeans the dignity and worth of our colleagues, then we are not creating an environment which values diversity. If University officials (me included) are perceived as being unresponsive to the concerns of Blacks and women, as defined by Blacks and women, then the image of institutional racism and/or sexism is real and must be addressed. For example, when the Women's Focus Group makes a recommendation for a Women's Center and this is established as a Coordinator of Women Students' Services on par with Student Activities in the Department of Student Life of the Division of Student Affairs, does this constitute a response to the concerns of women as defined by women? -

Another barrier to goal attainment is lack of commitment. Commitment is demonstrated in many ways. The Office of the Provost certainly demonstrated commitment by the set-aside of money for the hiring of Black faculty. But commitment (or lack thereof) is also clearly seen by the presence of **women and Blacks** in top level administrative positions where power, influence, and strategic decision-making lie.

Various approaches are used within an institution to encourage affirmative action compliance: incentives, coercion, directives, censure, education and training. Often it takes a combination of some or all of these approaches to produce results. Only when responsibilities are clearly defined and persons are held accountable for their actions by someone with the authority to do so, only then will real progress be made in achieving affirmative action and maintaining equal employment opportunity. Authority and resources are essential to the implementing of an affirmative action program which requires institution-wide cooperation and involvement.

SPECIFIC PROBLEM AREAS

In monitoring hiring decisions, after the fact, (usually a year after they have taken place) we conduct impact ratio analyses to identify any job categories in which women or Blacks are adversely affected in the selection process. Generally, there is greater evidence of adverse impact by race rather than by gender. Statistics for October 1, 1987 to September 30, 1988 revealed that, as in previous years, adverse impact on Blacks in the hiring process is pervasive, a problem that is especially critical in the classified area. With respect to unclassified personnel, no adverse impact on women was indicated and for the first time in years there was no adverse impact on Blacks in the hiring of faculty, because of the leadership exercised and resources made available by the Office of the Provost. This commitment must continue if we are to reach parity.

In the classified job categories, applicant pools are usually representative, largely due to the active recruiting strategies of the Employment Manager, but for some reason hiring supervisors are not appointing Blacks to positions in expected numbers. For example, in 1987-88 there were thirty-five hires made in the student personnel job group, but only two Blacks were selected for appointments from a combined pool of one hundred and thirty-six qualified Black applicants. Similarly, thirty positions were filled in the entry level technical job group, with Blacks receiving only two hires from among one hundred and sixty-two qualified Black applicants.

Statistics such as these provide prima facie evidence of discrimination and the onus rests on the University to prove otherwise. At a minimum, they shed doubt as to whether equal employment opportunity is afforded all qualified applicants.

At the bottom rung of the classified job groups in terms of grade and salary, entry-level service/maintenance, there is a concentration of Blacks. Ninety-seven percent of the employees in this job category are Black. No problem in hiring Blacks here; the problem is one of upward mobility. An impact ratio analysis of promotions for 1987-88 revealed adverse impact on Blacks in entry and mid level service/maintenance. For example, there were ten promotional opportunities at the entry level job group. Whites, who numbered only ten persons in this job group, received two of the promotions, while Blacks, numbering three hundred, received eight of the promotions. Because of the concentration of Blacks in the service/maintenance area, the institution should design an upward mobility program to provide the necessary training and development to enable the employees in this job category to prepare themselves for promotional opportunities.

These are but a few examples of problem areas that are the consequences of those barriers to affirmative action: lack of knowledge, indifference, resistance, denial, lack of broad-based commitment, and absence of accountability measures.

DIRECTION

If affirmative action efforts are to produce meaningful results, responsibility for the implementation of affirmative action at USC must be assumed by all persons in the institution: the Chief Executive Officer who establishes affirmative action as a priority and allocates the necessary resources for the task; the supervisors who take the time to learn the art of supervision and to make employment decisions that are equitable and fair; the chief academic officer at each campus holding Deans accountable for affirmative action goal attainment; faculty and staff who interact with their colleagues in a non-discriminatory manner creating an environment in which the dignity and worth of each individual is respected; controllers and business managers who ensure that minority businesses are offered the opportunity to participate fully in the procurement process.

Affirmative action responsibilities, principles and practices must be infused into the very fabric of the institution. This is the message that I strive to get across. Affirmative action is not housed in the Affirmative Action Office. Affirmative Action is a corporate effort; it is the responsibility of everyone at the institution to promote affirmative action and equal opportunity in terms of access, upward mobility, and the work and educational environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I make the following recommendations in order to lend some direction to the focus that is essential to attaining equity at The USC. This is not an exhaustive list of recommendations, neither do I profess to have all the answers.

Accountability Measures & Recruitment Strategies:

I have stressed the need for instituting measures by which persons who make hiring decisions are held accountable for their actions. The following recommendations refer to accountability measures and recruitment strategies.

- The USC Employee Performance Management System requires that supervisors whose responsibilities include hiring or promoting must be evaluated on the managerial characteristic which measures their efforts at promoting equal opportunity. For this requirement to be effective, there must be some means for documenting and verifying the documentation provided in support of the individual's efforts at promoting AA/EEO.

- Whenever there is a hiring opportunity in a classified job group in which Blacks and/or women are underutilized, it may be necessary for the Employment Manager and the Affirmative Action Officer to become directly involved in the hiring decision and approve the selection if the underutilization is to be eliminated as rapidly as possible. This is a tall order because of the number of positions filled annually and the extent of the underrepresentation of Blacks and women in the work force. But something must be done since impact ratio analyses continue to

show evidence of adverse impact in the selection process. My preference is really to have hiring officials make their own hiring decisions in a responsible and equitable manner. **But this** decentralized; non-directed system has not been producing any significant reduction in the underutilization of women and Blacks.

- Persons who make hiring decisions at any level should specify the job related criteria by which each applicant was eliminated and by which the successful candidate selected. This information is often not readily available when external agencies conducting compliance reviews request it.

- Each dean of a college in which Blacks and/or women are underrepresented on the faculty should be required by the Provost to develop, in consultation with the System Affirmative Action Officer, an annual plan for eliminating this underutilization and their performance evaluation could be based in part on the success of the recruitment plan. Requests to make an offer should include documentation of the affirmative recruiting strategies employed and justification of the selection decision if Blacks or White females are not selected and they are underutilized in the department. It would be helpful if the System Affirmative Action Officer were given an opportunity to

review and comment on the documented recruitment efforts before the Provost makes a decision as to whether or not to approve a request to make an offer.

- Because of the low availability of Blacks and women in the sciences and engineering and the corresponding difficulty in identifying them for faculty openings, more time could be allowed for certain faculty searches, informally beginning the search (scouting) at least two years before a current faculty member retires.

- The System Affirmative Action Office has a cooperative working relationship with the System Personnel Division. A similar relationship needs to be developed with a designated liaison in the Office of the Provost to serve as a conduit for reaching the academic community and for monitoring the academic hiring process.

- When women or minorities terminate from the University, it may be useful if the System Affirmative Action Office were notified so that the officer may conduct an exit interview to determine if AA/EEO issues led to the termination.

Training and Development:

Some of the barriers to AA/EEO reflect a lack of knowledge and training on the issues involved. The following recommendations address training and development.

- Supervisory training should be mandatory for all persons with supervisory responsibilities, administrators, faculty, and staff with AA/EEO issues being fully integrated into the supervisory training series.

- As part of the supervisory training series, hiring officials need to be made aware of the University's obligations to take affirmative action to hire and promote qualified handicapped individuals, disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era. Classified jobs may need to be analyzed so that the essential and non-essential job functions are identified. Such an analysis would assist supervisors in evaluating whether a handicapped individual with reasonable accommodation is qualified to perform the essential functions of the job.

- Racism and sexism awareness and sensitivity training should be available and required at least for new faculty and staff. Resources would need to be allocated for the purpose of developing a quality training program on these issues.

- There is an urgent need for sexual harassment prevention training to be provided to all administrators, faculty, staff and students. The Personnel Training Office is arranging for this training which I hope will be given the fullest support and reception throughout the System.

Upward Mobility:

It has been said that upward mobility may be the next frontier for affirmative action. The following recommendations relate to the barriers to upward mobility.

- The GED Preparation Program currently operated by the Custodial Department needs to be expanded, enhanced, and extended to the entire service/maintenance area. This program could be the nucleus of a an Upward Mobility Program designed to prepare service/maintenance staff for career advancement and personal development. Perhaps the College of Education could spearhead this project in consultation with Mr. Bill Gilchrist, Director of Custodial Services.

- Generally, across the classified job series, the mystery needs to be taken out of career paths and a career assessment and guidance program developed to assist employees in making career choices and preparing for promotional opportunities. Some career guidance is provided to employees on a limited and informal basis through the University Career Center. It would require additional resources in the form of staff, facilities, and budget to extend career guidance services to employees.

- Steps could be taken to explore the possibility of developing an apprenticeship program in the skilled crafts area as a means of attracting more women to these non-traditional jobs.

Public Relations:

It is important to project and protect the institution's image as an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. To promote good public relations I suggest the following:

- University Relations could take a proactive stance in bringing before the public the efforts and successes of the University in promoting affirmative action and equal opportunity. This proactive mode is preferable to that of reacting to bad press coverage.

- The Office of the President may consider recognizing in some meaningful way those University officials who have contributed significantly to the achievement of the institution's affirmative action goals.

Affirmative Action Advisory Committee:

The Affirmative Action Advisory Committee has been a tremendous asset to the affirmative action program at this institution. To enhance institutional coordination it would be beneficial for this Committee to interface in some way with the Handicapped Advisory Committee. I am suggesting that one possibility could be for the chair of the Handicapped Advisory Committee to be designated a member of the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee.

CONCLUSION

You will notice that my recommendations touch **on a broad** cross-section of the University Community. This is the approach necessary to mainstream affirmative action and equal employment opportunity. Although affirmative action and equal opportunity issues are competing with a host of other priorities deserving attention, resources must be committed to this effort throughout the institution.

USC will soon have its sixth affirmative action officer. It is not an easy job. There are fewer positions in higher education as complex and as little understood as that of AA/EEO officer. In an article on the EEO Officer in Higher Education, Myrtle Reul, a professor of social work who was an affirmative action officer, describes some of the necessary attributes of an affirmative action officer as follows:

"In the real-life, day-to-day world, EEO jobs call for

- the patience of Job
- the skin of a rhinoceros
- the persistence of a bulldog
- the retention of an elephant
- ~ - the surveillance of a hawk
- the wisdom of Solomon
- intermixed with flexibility and
- the capacity to handle minute detail
- plus, the ability to recharge your own battery and bounce back from constant pressure and lack of progress, and continuous criticism."

This litany of attributes is not as tongue-in-cheek as it may sound. I have been fortunate to have an excellent staff and cooperative colleagues with whom to work. I thank you for your encouragement and guidance in the past and am confident that you will be supportive of my successor. This office fulfills its mission by working through other people and it has been

gratifying working with you all and knowing that there is a growing contingent of persons like yourselves who are striving to instill the principles of affirmative action and equal opportunity into all aspects of life and work at The USC.

PNC

6/19/89

FAREWELL.89