

John Samms

Regional Campus Faculty Senate

Minutes of Meeting

November 22, 1974

The Regional Campus Faculty Senate met on November 22, 1974 at the Lancaster Regional Campus in Lancaster, S. C. The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, Ms. Carolyn Wynn (Spartanburg), at 2:00 p.m. Visitors present were Prof Marnie Foster and Dr. Peter Barry from the Lancaster Campus.

Corrections to the minutes

Chpn. Wynn called for corrections to the minutes of the October 4, 1974 meeting. There were no correction with the exception of the following typographical errors; on page 1, the ninth word in the second line of the last parograph is Nolte; on page 1, the eight word in the first line of the tenth paragraph is Elam; on page 4 the sixth word in the seventh paragraph is Curtis and on page 5, the first word in the fourth paragraph is Emilie

Comments by University Officials

Dr. H. W. Davis commented on the development of some of the Regional Campus. The Board of Trustees approved 8-10 n'w programs for Coastal Carolina. This approval was forwarded to the Commission on Higher Education (CHE). The Commission approved all programs with the exception of the Bachelor of General Studies Program which was deferred until the University could prepare a Cracher Extensiv report of what the Columbus Campus is doing in their Bachelor of General Studies Program. That report is in preparation.

Spartanburg is almost at the same point. A list of proposals for degree programs has been submitted to Dr. Davis's office. These will be on the agenda of the next Board meeting and will go then to the following CHE meeting.

Aiken, in the 900 FTE region, will have to wait until next September to see if that figure will hold.

Dr. Davis is preparing recommendations to President Patterson and the Board having to do with academic autonomy for Coastal and Spartanburg. This would include degree requirements and faculty appointments. Dr. Davis commented that these changes will have rather severe repercussions for the Regional Campus "System". Also, he feels that Coastal and Spartanburg will soon cease to be a part of the Regional Campus Senate.

The CHE has been working on a formula for funding higher education in the state. CHE is slows about getting to the Regional Campuses. Dr. Davis stated that he did not come prepared to go through all the in's and out's of the formula. In terms of dollars, the state appropriation to the Regional Campuses was about \$4.4 million.. (projected number of students x \$800). Coastal received an extra \$148 thousand and Aiken and Spartanburg received an extra \$125 thousand each for expansion. \$355 thousand was allotted for salary increases so that the total to the Regional Campuses was about \$5.2 million for

the operation of the campuses. The request for next years asks for Coastal and Spartanburg to be placed on the four year funding formula. The total four requested was \$7.5 million plus CHE recommended \$5.9 plus. Instead of giving four year funding for Coastal and Spartanburg. These campuses were allotted an extra \$238 thousand and \$285 thousand respectively and Aiken received a supplement of \$125 thousand. Thus the total ended up being about \$6.58 million. The Budget and Control Board has recommended \$6.2 million, based on projection per student less than that called for by the formula but probably a little higher than \$800 per FTE, 3 1/2 % additional funds for salary increase and 25% additional funds for supplies. Dr. Davis commented that the economic situation is primarily responsible for the cuts. As a result the biggest problem will be with four-year development at Coastal and Spartanburg.

The Columbia Campus will be voting on Tuesday, November 26, on a new rank and tenure procedure. The Regional Campuses will be expected to work out procedures agreeable in spirit with the Columbia Campus procedures but exact agreement will be impossible because of our different situation. The three larger campuses will, of necessity, have their own procedures. Since the number of tenured faculty in the smaller campus is limited, it would be impossible to set up a committee of tenured faculty to consider promotion and tenure.

Dr. John J. Duffy distributed the Regional Campus Salary Study and a compilation of statistics concerning FTE faculty, Faculty-Student ratio, Student-Credit hour per FTE faculty, etc., for Regional Campuses, Columbia Campus, and Clemson University. Dr. Duffy explained how the figures were determined and their implications.

He pointed out that as long as budgets are based on formulas, these rather "cold" statistics don't include time spent in community service, professional advancement and organizations, internal service research, etc. Aiken has submitted a specific report on the Science faculty activities. Dr. Duffy recommended that the Directors take a look at the instrument used by Aiken to determine what is expected of faculty, area by area. This work was in response to a request from the Senate at its last meeting. Dr. Duffy stated that as accurate statement of what is expected of Regional Campus faculty can not be made at this time because only the Aiken science faculty has made the necessary survey. But he expressed appreciation to the Senate for getting him started on this.

A number of questions were asked of Dr. Duffy for the purpose of clarifying the statistics. In particular, Dr. Calvin Smith (Aiken) asked about the meaning of the student-faculty ratio. Dr. Smith expressed concern for the discrepancy between the S/F ratio and the average section size. Dr. Duffy explained that the S/F ratio was taken directly from the computer printout but that is essentially an artificial number. Nevertheless, the S/F ratio plays an important role in formula funding.

Dr. James Brown (Spartanburg) asked for clarification concerning the 3 1/2% salary increase mentioned earlier by Dr. Davis. Dr. Duffy pointed out that this, while not much, was an inflationary factor that was plugged into the formula. It does not mean that salary raises will be 3 1/2%. We will not know this until next spring. A copy of Dr. Duffy's report is attached to these minutes.

Chpn. Wynn announced that Budget Director R. W. Denton could not attend as p

previously planned. Dr. Duffy indicated that Mr. Wade and Dr. Davis had pretty well covered what Mr. Denton would have said.

Reports from Standing Committees

Mr. Wade Chittam (Lancaster), Chair person of the Financial Concerns Committee stated that his committee had nothing to report nor any recommendations to make. The committee is, however, following up in formation from other state institutions and will probably have recommendations to make at the next meeting of the Senate.

Mr. Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster), Chairperson of the Rights and Responsibilities committee, commented that his committee had a recommendation to make concerning the Faculty Manual Report. Discussion on this matter was deferred to the Unfinished Business section of the meeting.

Mr. Andrew Crosland (Spartanburg), Chairperson of the Intra-University Services and Communications committee (IUCS), reported two recommendations from his committee. First, Prof. Crosland moved that the Regional Campus Office send a question ~~note~~ ^{note} to each Regional Campus faculty member to determine if he wishes to deliver a special program, upon request at other Regional Campuses. A list of all such programs is then to be disseminated to all Regional Campuses. Prof. Crosland remarked that this amounts to setting up a Speaker's Bureau among the Campuses. The motion passed unanimously.

Second, Prof. Crosland, in response to Mr. Ken Toombs's report concerning Regional Campus faculty use of Columbia Campus libraries, moved that Regional Campus Faculty members who have checked out books from the Columbia Campus be allowed to renew the books by telephone. Prof. Crosland explained that this would allow Regional Campus faculty the ability to renew books without having to travel to Columbia. As there was no discussion, voting followed immediately. The motion passed unanimously.

Special Committee Report

Dr. Calvin Smith (Aiken) reported for the Columbia Campus courses and Curriculum committee. Dr. Smith indicated that the meeting he had attended did not consider any matters of immediate importance to the Regional Campuses other than the proposed major in Office Administration. Details of this will appear in the Columbia Campus Senate minutes. Dr. Smith advised the Senators that they should read the Columbia Campus Senate minutes.

Ms. Edna Shook (Lancaster), representative on the Columbia Campus Library Committee, reported that the committee has not yet met.

Dr. James Brown (Spartanburg), reported for the Task Force on University Organization and Administration. Dr. Brown commented further on the Rank and Tenure policy that the Columbia Campus faculty will vote on.

The reason that the preamble to the proposed included the Regional Campuses is that the Chairman of the Board of Trustees wanted a University wide policy. But the last item of the proposed says essentially that each Regional Campus should devise a proposal in light of the principles involved in the Columbia Campus's proposal. The main reason for the change was to get away from a situation in which a single individual had total control of promotion and tenure within a department, school or college and to place recommendation for promotion and tenure in the hands of a peer group of faculty members. Thus the Regional Campuses can expect to be asked to devise

promotion and tenure policies for their campuses.

Mr. Churchill Curtis (Salkahatchie), representative to the Provost Search Committee with President Patterson. Ms. Judy Sessions (Salkahatchie) presented a letter from Prof. Curtis, which read as follows;

I apologize once again for my absence from the Faculty Senate but my responsibilities to the Provost Search Committee have entered their most important stage. We are now conducting interview of both the internal and external candidates in Columbia. Our winnowing continues. The committee's visitations reduced our list. I can assure the Regional Campus Faculty Senate that the committee's activities and thorough. Each committee member has been responsive to the specific concerns of the Regional Campus System. Each has questioned candidates fully about intra-University relations and has assumed that each was aware of the special interests of the System. I shall have a fuller report at our first Spring meeting.

Mr. Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster), reported for two committees. The academic Advisory and Faculty Liaison Committee and the Reorganization and REstructure committee. Prof. Nunnery reported that the Academic Advisory and Faculty Liaison Committee has not met since the last Faculty Senate meeting. Prof. Nunnery conveyed a portion of the minutes of the meeting of the Reorganization and Restructure Committee. Those minutes are included as an attachment to these minutes.

Dr. Gordon Haist (Beaufort) reported for the Columbia Campus Faculty Welfare Committee. He reported that this committee is becoming a very active committee, meeting on Wednesday at 11:15 a.m. The committee is presently considering the issue of tuition remission for faculty members' spouses and children. AT present it must be demonstrated that the University will not lose a substantial portion of its income by providing this service. It will take an act of the state legislature to change the situation. However, Dr. Haist expressed the opinion that the issue will not be carried very far in the near future. The issue of fringe benefits has led to a proposal for devising a priority list of fringe benefits. The committee is presently in vestigating, tax sheltered annuities as an option to the state Retirement System. The committee will invite President Patterson and Chairman T. Eston Marchant (Board of Trustees) to work out the issue of fringe benefits, Dr. Haist informed the Senate that he is unable to meet with the committee because of its meeting time and consequently resigned as the REgional Campus Representative to the Faculty Welfare Committee of the Columbia Campus.

The discussion which followed concerned the possibility that the meeting time might be changed. Dr. Haist indicated that the meeting time of the Faculty Welfare Committee was arrived at quite arduously and it is highly unlikely that the time will be changed.

Dr. H. W. Dole related the history of this remission to the Senate and also the appropriate particularly in the vesting period, made in the state Retirement System. There was also taken that TIAA is also available and packages were asked to faculty.

Chpn. Wynn reminded the Senate that, under the circumstances, the time had come to consider nominations for the representative to the Columbia Campus Faculty Welfare Committee. While Senators were thinking about possible nominees,

Could not attend this Senate meeting due to a meeting

W. W. Dole

possible nominees, Dr. Reginald Brasington was given the floor to discuss the current Educational Foundation drive and its importance. He pointed out that 100% of the Lancaster faculty had contributed to the drive. Campuses should restrict their donations to their respective campuses. This helps two ways: first, this provides money for establishment of scholarship and other programs at the Regional Campus and, second, helps the University in its out side drives by providing exemplary material for the campaign.

After Dr. Brasington remarks the floor was opened for nominations for the representative to the Columbia Campus Faculty Welfare Committee. The nominees were Mr. John Woodward (Military) and Mr. Fred Casoli (Military). Mr. Sam Greenly (Beaufort) asked for a recess to caucus on the matter. The request was granted. After the recess, the floor was opened for further nomination. Mr. Jerry Dockery (Military) was also nominated. In the voting which followed, Prof Dockery was elected as the representative to the Columbia Campus Faculty Welfare Committee. The Secretary was duly instructed to inform Dr. John Herr, Chairman of the Columbia Campus Faculty Senate, of the matter.

Unfinished Business

The Right and Responsibilities committee entered a motion to amend the Faculty Manual Report, item 2, to increase the maximum number of Senators form a campus. Prof. Nunnery explained that the rationale behind the motion was that the larger campuses are under-represented in that each campus has at least three senators but no campus can have more than five. A procedural question was brought to the floor by Dr. James Brown (Spartaburg) concerning whether the vote will be on individual amendments or all amendments as a whole. Dr. Brown then asked about the substantive nature of the above amendment. Prof Nunnery pointed out that the Faculty Manual Report was distributed last time for study and recommended cahanges at this meeting. But while the motion from the Right and Responibilities Committee is substantive, it does have direct bearing on the report and can thus be considered at this meeting.

The question was raised by Dr. Brown as to when the motion from the Right and Responibilities Committee, if passed by the Senate, would become effective. The same question was applied to all the changes. It was pointed out that the effective date of the changes will be upon appoveal of the Board of Trústees.

At this point the motion itself came under discussion. Mr. John Stine (Union) indicated a feeling that the motion represented a plot by the "behemoths" to take control of the Senate. He requested Prof. Nunnery to explain the rationale behind the motion. Prof. Nunnery pointed out that the rationale had already been presented and thus conveyed to Mr. Stine and the SEnate "some of the thinking of the committee." According to Prof. Nunnery, the maximum number of Senators to 7 per FTE but that a committee member from one of the larger campuses had pointed out the lack of room in their station-wagon for seven Senators. A committee member from one of the smaller campuses made the same point as Mr. Stine and thus the committee decided on the maximum of 6 per 600 FTE and above.

Further discussion ensued touching on a number of related points including the fairness of the present situation, the possibility of voting blocks, the possibility of one of the larger campuses separating from the Senate (although Senators From that campus do not) and House and the Regional Campus Senate. Dr. Haist asked whether the committee had discussed any other models of representation. Prof Nunnery responded that the committee had not. The motion was brought to a vote and was passed by a margin of 18-6.

Mr. Wade Chittam (Lancaster) entered a motion from the Lancaster faculty. The motion was as follows:

To add to item 16 of the Faculty Manual Report, the statement before bringing a matter before the Regional Campus Faculty Senate Grievance Committee, a faculty member should have attempted to resolve the matter through all appropriate means available and should demonstrate this to the Grievance Committee.

Dr. Haist asked for the motive behind the motion. Prof. Chittam responded that this procedure is not specifically spelled out in the manual and that it should be clearly stated in the manual. Prof. Nunnery pointed out that the motion simply clarifies what has become an established, but unstated, procedure. Dr. Haist disagreed in that if a faculty member has a grievance, he should have access to the Grievance Committee to find out what also expressed the feeling that this procedure would tend to stifle grievance. The motion was defeated by a vote of 7 to 14.

Dr. Brown moved to consider the two motions entered at the last meeting from the Right and Responsibilities Committee. The motion was seconded and passed by acclamation.

The first of the motion to be considered was as follows:

To delete the last sentence of paragraph 1, page 25 of the Faculty Manual under Terms of Employment, that sentence being: "Summer school teaching in the case of faculty hired after 1 September, 1973 for September, 1974 may depend on availability of funds and / or size of enrollment."

Dr. Brown pointed out that those faculty hired before 1 September, 1973 are essentially guaranteed summer employment and that this motion would extend that same guarantee to faculty members hired after 1 September, 1973. There are no major problems now in finding summer employment for every one, but in a tight situation, faculty hired after 1 September, 1973 would have a lower priority than others. If the above motion were passed, Dr. Brown continued, courses would have to be spread among all faculty so that in a situation of low enrollment faculty would be teaching only three hours (instead of six) and getting 7.5% rather 15% of the nine months salary.

Questions were raised about the current practice and the discriminatory nature of the present policy. Dr. Davis pointed out that letters of appointment no longer guarantee summer employment and that the present policy is anyway, a moral commitment rather than a formal guarantee. A question was raised as to the legal aspects of the situation with particular attention to whether, in a court case, the University could be made to provide summer employment for a faculty member whose letter of appointment continued the guarantee of summer work. Prof. Nunnery related that the opinion

of two lawyers with whom he had discussed the matter, was that the University would lose a court suit brought on the letter of appointment by a faculty member. But, he further stated this is only an opinion, not a decision.

The question was raised as to whether the motion to delete also deleted the "moral" obligation to provide summer employment. The comment was made that the motion does not delete the moral obligation, but rather gives everyone the same status. Mr. John Samaras (Lancaster) read the paragraph in question from the Faculty Manual and commented that there are sufficient disclaimers in the paragraph which, under severe condition, remove any guarantee of summer employment. The question was called for. The motion was brought to a vote and passed by a vote 15-5.

The second of the motion to be considered was as follows:

To add to the Faculty Manual, page 25, the following statement:

"A faculty member may request and be allowed to teach an additional summer school session in lieu of hiring outside personnel."

Dr. Davis provided history on the present practice. The faculty itself took the initiative to restrict summer teaching to one session. The motivation was twofold: first, to give everyone the opportunities to teach during the summer and second, to provide respite from teaching. Prof. Nunnery agreed with the philosophy but pointed out that some faculty can not do without the employment and in some cases a faculty member found it necessary to work in construction or hamburger restaurants while someone from outside the University was paid to teach a course which could, perhaps, have been better taught by the faculty member. The motion carried unanimously.

Finally, the report of Ad Hoc Committee to Study Possible Changes in the Faculty Manual, as amended, was brought to the floor. Chpn Wynn called upon the Senate to consider the report, as amended, as a whole rather than item by item. The Senate concurred and the report was approved by a unanimous vote. The report will now be passed on to the president and from there to the Board of Trustees. A copy of the Faculty Manual Report, as amended by the Senate, is attached to these minutes.

New Business

There was no new business.

Announcements

Chpn Wynn reminded the Senate that its next meeting will be held on February 7, 1975. Items to appear on the agenda should be submitted to the Executive Committee before its meeting on January 17, 1975.

Ms. Linda Schwartz (Coastal) pointed out that the fourth meeting of the Senate was scheduled during the Spring Recess. Chmn Wynn stated that a change in the meeting date will be announced at the next meeting.

As there were no other announcements the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

John M. Samaras

John M. Samaras
Secretary

Attachment A
1974-1975 Regional Campus Salary
Study
(Based on 9 months employment)

| Campus | Instructor | | | Assistant Prof | | |
|--------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Aiken | *7(10,533) 73,732 | 4(10,283) 41,133 | 3(10,866) 32,599 | 30(11,688) 350,640 | 18(12,135) 218,426 | 12(11,018) 132,214 |
| Beaufort | 4(9,975) 39,899 | 1(9,500) 9,500 | 3(10,133) 30,399 | 5(11,375) 56,877 | 2(12,221) 24,442 | 3(10,812) 32,435 |
| Coastal | 16(10,416) 166,651 | 7(10,173) 71,212 | 9(10,604) 95,439 | 39(11,699) 456,271 | 28(11,998) 335,931 | 11(10,940) 120,340 |
| Lancaster | 12(9,854) 118,246 | 8(9,905) 79,251 | 4(9,751) 39,005 | 10(10,368) 103,675 | 7(11,606) 81,240 | 3(10,812) 32,435 |
| Salkehatchie | 11(10,324) 3(9,753) 29,259 | 2(9,296) 18,591 | 1(10,668) 10,668 | 11(10,667) 117,335 | 7(10,746) 75,220 | 4(10,529) 42,115 |
| Spartanburg | 11(10,324) 113,559 | 7(10,741) 75,187 | 4(9,593) 38,372 | 23(11,853) 272,610 | 17(12,011) 204,190 | 6(11,403) 68,420 |
| Sumter | 7(10,383) 72,678 | 6(10,709) 64,252 | 1(8,426) 8,426 | 9(11,675) 105,074 | 8(11,678) 93,425 | 1(11,649) 11,649 |
| Union | 6(9,832) 58,991 | 4(10,028) 40,110 | 2(9,440) 18,881 | 9(11,111) 99,996 | 8(10,961) 87,691 | 1(12,305) 12,305 |
| Total | 66(10,197) 673,015 | 39(10,237) 399,226 | 27(10,140) 273,789 | 136(11,489) 1,562,478 | 95(11,795) 1,120,565 | 41(11,022) 451,913 |

| <u>Campus</u> | <u>Associate Prof</u> | | | <u>Professor</u> | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| | <u>Total</u> | <u>Male</u> | <u>Female</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Male</u> | <u>Female</u> |
| Aiken | 2(14,520) 29,039 | 2(14,520) 29,039 | - - | 1(14,224) 14,224 | 1(14,224) 14,224 | - - |
| Beaufort | 3(12,465) 37,395 | 3(12,465) 37,395 | - - | - - | - - | - - |
| Coastal | 12(14,465) 173,578 | 11(14,515) 159,668 | 1(13,910) 13,910 | 3(16,382) 49,145 | 3(16,382) 49,145 | - - |
| Lancaster | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - |
| Salkehatchie | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - |
| Spartanburg | 3(14,579) 42,736 | 2(14,420) 28,839 | 1(13,897) 13,897 | 1(16,933) 16,933 | 1(16,933) 16,933 | - - |
| Sumter | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - |
| Union | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - |
| Total | 20(14,137) 282,748 | 18(14,163) 254,941 | 2(13,904) 27,806 | 5(16,060) 80,302 | 5(16,060) 80,302 | - - |

*Total number persons employed in respective group and average salary

NOTE: Study encompasses Instructors, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Full Professors only. Does not reflect salaries of Directors, Coordinators, Teaching Associates, Lecturers or visiting Professors.

| Campus | FTE Faculty | Student Credit Hour Per FTE Faculty | Student Faculty | Average Load | Average Section Size | Ratio Contact Credit Hour |
|--------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Aiken | 54.9 | 239 | 15.9-1 | 11.3 | 23.2 | 1.131 |
| Beaufort | 16.2 | 204 | 13.6-1 | 11.8 | 19.0 | 1.08-1 |
| Coastal | 81.8 | 210 | 14.0-1 | 14.2 | 18.4 | 1.151 |
| Lancaster | 31.3 | 219 | 14.6-1 | 12.6 | 19.3 | 1.06-1 |
| Salkehatchie | 17.0 | 184 | 12.2-1 | 13.5 | 15.1 | 1.12-1 |
| Spartanburg | 61.3 | 264 | 17.6-1 | 12.3 | 24.7 | 1.26-1 |
| Sumter | 23.5 | 246.1 | 16.4-1 | 12.6 | 21.4 | 1.12-1 |
| Union | 16.1 | 208 | 13.8-1 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 1.05-1 |
| Formula Norm | | 300 | 20.0-1 | | | |
| USC Main | 237 | 18.0-2 | 12.1 | 27.2 | 1.19-1 | |
| Clemson | 250 | 17.9-1 | 13.0 | 22.9 | 1.23-1 | |

*Approximate

DEFinitions of FTE Faculty - is full time teaching faculty irrespective of course load or administration or part time faculty based on 10 hours as a divisor.

Attachment B

Committee to Study the Possible Reorganization of the Administrative Structure of the University

November 6, 1974

A meeting of the Committee to Study the Possible Reorganization of the Administrative Structure of the University was held in the Board Room of the Osborne Administration Building at 3:00 p.m., Wednesday, November 6, 1974.

Member present were, Mr. Michael J. Mungo, Chairman; Professors Wade Batson, James Black, and Jimmie Nunnery; and Messrs. Paul Goldsmith and John Lumpkin. Also present was Dr. Keith Davis, acting Provost of the University.

Chairman Mungo cited numerous administrative changes which had taken place since this Committee was organized and which had made the task of the Committee a difficult one and its charge uncertain. He stated that the foremost goal of the University of South Carolina is to become an excellent one. He informed the Committee that this meeting was called for the the purpose of determining where we are and where we fo from here.

At this point, the Chairman recognized Dr. Wade Batson, co-chairman of the academic sub-committee, for his report (A copy of the report is attached as Exhibit A.) After presentation of the report, Dr. Batson invited questions. Professor Nunnery requested the deletion of the word "new" in the last sentence of recommendation 1 should be carried out as expeditiously as possible. The Committee agreed with him that this period of search had been much too long and that a choice should be made as soon as possible. This report was adopted as amended

A discussion ensued concerning the present tenure requirement and regulations and the importance of evaluation of instructors with regard to tenure decisions. Chairman Mungo emphasized the importance of having senior professors teach some freshman level courses as well as their regular higher course load.

Mr. John Lumpkin, co-chairman of the administrative sub-committee, was asked to present his report to the Committee at this time. He recommended that the Seigler report remain open for future consideration of other refinement. (The Seigler report and documents are attached as Exhibit C.) The Committee agreed to adopt the report as presented by Mr. Lumpkin.

The Committee then discussed the need to publicize the academic programs and educational excellence of the University. Suggestions were made as to how this information could be disseminated; e.g., through high school teachers, human interest stories about graduates of University, a feature story on the new position of Vice-President for Instruction when the position is filled, etc.

Upon completion of this discussion, the meeting adjourned.

With the belief that the University exists for the purpose of providing academic instruction for the sons and daughters of the tax payers of South Carolina, the subcommittee wishes to express its strong desire to see the academic program of the University receive foremost and maximum attention and the faculty made to realize that their job there is the

Attachment B-p3 Exhibit A

With the belief that the University exists for the purpose of providing academic instruction for the sons and daughters of the tax payers of South Carolina, the subcommittee wishes to express its strong desire to see the academic program of the University receive foremost and maximum attention and the faculty made to realize that their job here is the critical one and that we, the Board, and Administration, are aware of this and that we support them. We also view with real satisfaction the recognition of much of this idea by the new Administration as evidenced by the recent creation of the office of Vice President for Instruction, a first in our history. With intended support for this move and a desire to focus attention on some other related matters, we respectfully make the following recommendations:

1. That the present search committee for Provost be encouraged to look with great diligence for a capable, vigorous and highly motivated leader for academics. a capable, vigorous and highly motivated leader for academics.

2. That the proper authority -- Provost, appropriate committee, Faculty Senate or other -- be encouraged to emphasize the importance of absolutely top quality instruction at the freshman and sophomore levels and to take whatever steps that are necessary to provide for real teaching proficiency. Periodic review and evaluation of instructors by tenured faculty might be considered as one means of insuring this end.

3. That the President, Vice President for Instruction or other appropriate administrator be made cognizant that over or under-funding and over-staffing may exist in certain areas and that consideration be given to this, possibly through the establishment of a committee of senior, experienced professors, acting as a sort of budget and control board, to look over these matters and advise the President regarding equitable distribution of funds and personnel.

FOREWORD TO DOCUMENT A

This Ad Hoc (Seigler) Committee began its work with two stated views: that the basic function of a university is to bring together two groups of people, faculty and students, both of whom seek knowledge, the quality of each group striving toward excellence; and that this committee would not concern itself with idealized conditions but would earnestly attempt to present recommendations for plans that will operate successfully in this university in this time and place. No attempt has been made to make a comparison of what has been performed here by any individual or group to that which may be contemplated. A constant effort involving studies based on practices and operations in this university and in neighboring state universities has been maintained with a view to presenting matters that would be workable and practical. To that end this committee has sought all aid and knowledge that it could obtain: the result is almost an equal division of assistance and information from student, administrative, and faculty areas.

A number of well-known studies show, something the academic grapevine had already carried on its wires, that universities which have set themselves up to function like corporations, ignoring the salient fact that they are primarily concerned with people, have had to back off and restructure themselves. In order not to name institutions the geographical location of some of these failures serves as a reminder: Berkeley, Pittsburgh, Detroit.

This committee makes ^{no} recommendations because an operation is being presently conducted at this or any other university, but it does make them because current observation by this committee shows them to be successful. Many small modifications and adaptations have had to be made for our use here. For example, the University of North Carolina discovered four decades ago how to relieve its president's office of some of its more worrisome burdens by shifting control of these areas to the faculty. It would be romantic to assume that a sudden shift can be effected here, but considerable attention has been paid towards ultimately accomplishing something of the same relief for the president of this university. The University of Georgia has a security system so excellent that it has received the top national award the last two years and has to be seen in operation to be believed. On the other hand, the annoying problems of parking encountered by the University of South Carolina and the University of Tennessee is partially absent from the Universities of North Carolina, Florida, and Georgia because of their being situated in relatively small towns. The University of Tennessee is a prime example of an exemplary fashion. The University of Florida has achieved notable success in communication within its walls. These are few examples of the many details that have come before this committee.

In presenting its recommendations for the administrative structure of this university, the committee observes two facts: that lateral dispersal of information between the top six or seven officers of an institution is a requisite; that duplicate reporting in many areas must be smoothly effected for satisfactory results. An easy example will illustrate: the housing office of any university deals with students and must, therefore, in some measure come under the cognizance of the official in charge of

17

student affairs; anyone who has had to balance a budget can see that the fiscal officer cannot operate with empty rooms. Each of these officials must have some input in what appears to be the simple process of placing a student in room.

No office and no person can operate effectively if time and effort are not controlled with a view towards productivity. The committee has therefore attempted in its recommendations to control sharply the number of persons reporting directly to the president, or to the provost. (The University of Georgia, for example, solves this problem by having all six of its vice presidents report to the president. The provost alone reports directly to the president. What has happened in the five years of this operation is that the president has been relieved but the office of the provost has bogged down and is now under scrutiny.)

This committee respectfully submits its recommendations to the Academic Forward Planning Committee requesting that Committee for permission to recommend minor modification as they become apparent.

Respectfully submitted
Milledge E. Seigler, Chairman
for the Committee

*These recommendations were unanimously adopted by the Ad Hoc Committee.
Milledge B. Seigler, Chairman

Attachment C

A report to the Regional Campus Faculty Senate from the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Possible Changes in the Regional Campus Faculty Manual

On July 15 and July 16, 1974, Committee members Sam Greenly (Beaufort), Linda Schwartz (Coastal Carolina), and John Samaras (Lancaster) met to review and discuss the Regional Campus Faculty Manual. Prior to the meeting Committee members had solicited and received suggestion and questions from faculty and administration at their respective campuses.

After much discussion and consideration the Committee to Study Possible Changes in the Regional Campus Faculty Manual submits the following recommendations to the Regional Campus Faculty Senate for its consideration and vote.

1. A few typographical and capitalization errors were noted throughout the manual. We will not list them individually here but we do recommend that before the next printing of manual these errors be corrected. A list of these errors will be available in a few weeks.

2. On Page 16, in section 2. Regional Campus Senate, b. Membership, add the following paragraph.

Each Regional Campus shall elect one (1) or more alternate Senators. The alternate Senator (s) shall substitute for the regular Senator (s) from his (their) campus in the event that the regular Senator(s) is (are) unable to attend a meeting of the Regional Campus Senate. Alternate Senators have the same privileges as the regular Senator(s) for whom they substitute. However, no campus shall have more than the allowable number of Senators participating at any one meeting of the Senate and/or its committees.

Also in the same Section, "full time students" should read "full time equivalent students."

3. On page 17, in section 2. Regional Campus Senate, g. Meeting, the word "President", in the third line, should be deleted.

4. In several places throughout the manual reference is made to a Chairman and to a "Vice Chairman", the committee feels that, since male chauvinism is no longer fashionable the appropriate terminology is "Chairperson" and "Vice Chairperson". Thus, the committee recommends that the official titles of the officers of the Senate be Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Secretary and that the new edition of the manual reflect this change.

5. On page 21, under promotion Procedures, the first sentence of the second paragraph should read "the Associate Vice President shall submit all recommendations with documentation to a council consisting of the Vice President and the Associate Vice President for Regional Campus.

6. On page 61, the Academic Organization Chart needs to reflect the recent changes in the University Administration.

7. On page 58, in the By-Laws of the Regional Campus Faculty Senate, Article VI-Executive Committee: in order to provide a certain amount of

continuity and also to benefit from the experience of the Senate Chairperson, the committee recommends that Article VI - Executive Committee read as follows :

Article VI - Executive Committee
The Executive Committee of the Regional Campus Faculty Senate shall consist of the Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson, the Secretary and the Immediate-past Chairperson of the Regional Campus Faculty Senate.

8. The manual is contradictory as to who is the presiding officer. (See p. 11, the last sentence under The director of the Regional Campus and p. 18, Section 3 Regional Campus Faculties, d. Organization.) In order to align the manual with current practices at some Regional Campuses and to allow some flexibility in this matter for both the Director and the faculty of the Regional Campus, the Committee recommends the following changes:

Page 11, the Director of the Regional Campus -- Strike the last sentence and substitute " The Director may call and preside over meeting of the faculty of the Regional Campus."

Page 18, Section 3 Regional Campus Faculties d. Organization-- Strike the last sentence and substitute " Each faculty may elect a Chairperson, who can may call and preside over meeting of the faculty of the Regional Campus, and a secretary.

9. The Executive Committee of the Regional Campus Faculty Senate is designated as the Grievance Committee for Regional Campus Faculty. The manual refers to this committee in three different places in as many different wordings. The Study Committee recommends that the Grievance Committee." Specifically, see pp. 22 and 25.

10. There are several sections in the manual in which "Department Head", "Dean" or other inappropriate titles are used when the official properly referred to should be the Director. These corrections should be made before the next edition of manual is printed.

11. On page 59, Standing Rules of the Regional Campus Faculty Senate, Rule II, paragraph 3, the standing committees are now, by resolution of the Senate, the Financial Concerns, the Intercampus Communication, and the Right and Responsibilities Committees.

12. On page 16, in section 2. Regional Campus Senate b. Membership, The manual states that Faculty Senators shall be elected annually. The Committee feels that not all campuses find this convenient to their own repetitive needs. Thus, the committee recommends that first sentence be replaced by the following:

The regional Campus Senate shall consist of a minimum of three Senators from the faculty of each Regional Campus. Senators shall be elected by procedures set up each individual campus.

13 While the Executive Committee is designated as the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee, that committee has no defined responsibilities. The Study Committee recommends that Regional Campus Faculty Senate adopt the statement of responsibilities of the Columbia Campus Committee on Grievances as the statement of responsibilities of the Regional Campus Faculty Senate Grievance Committee, to wit:

"The Faculty Senate Grievance Committee shall consider individual grievances brought before the committee by member of the faculty including full-time and part-time members, research professors, lecturers, and visiting professors. The committee shall carefully examine alleged grievances, and when in the judgement of the committee a grievance is determined to exist, it shall attempt to resolve the matter through mediation or other appropriate action."

The Study Committee further recommends that the above statement, prefaced by the remark "The Executive Committee of the Regional Campus Faculty Senate shall serve as the faculty Senate Grievance Committee" be placed in Section 2. Regional Campus Senate, f. Committees, page 17, immediately following the existing paragraph.

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T

The Ad Hoc Committee to Study Possible Changes in the Regional Campus Faculty Manual would like to express its gratitude to the faculty members and the administrators who provided input to the Committee. The information provided by them has been an invaluable aid to the Committee in completing its work.

Amendments to this Report:

1. On page 16, in section 2. Regional Campus Senate, b. membership, the existing paragraph be amended to read; consistent with Items 2 and 15, above:

The Regional Campus Senate shall consist of a minimum of 3 senators from the faculty of each Regional Campus. Senators shall be elected by procedures set up at each individual campus. Fall campus enrollments in which 400 full time equivalent students register shall be eligible for 4 senators, 500/5 senators and 600/6 senators. The Provost, the Vice-President for Regional Campuses, the Associate Vice-President for Regional Campuses, the Assistant Vice-President for Regional Campuses and the Regional Campus Directors are ex officio members of the Senate without vote

2. Delete the last sentence of paragraph 1, page 25 of the of the Faculty Manual, that sentence being:

"Summer school teaching in the case of faculty hired after 1 September, 1973 for September, 1974 may depend upon availability and/or size of enrollment."

3. Add to the Faculty Manual, page 25, the following statement: "A faculty member may request and be allowed to teach an additional summer school session in lieu of hiring outside personnel."