

Regional Campus Faculty Senate
Minutes of Meeting
November 14, 1975

This is 1975

Welcome

The second meeting of the 1975-76 Regional Campus Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairperson Emily Towler (Aiken). The Chair announced that Professor Vincent Mesaric (Beaufort) would assume the duties of Secretary for the meeting, due to the absence, necessitated by a death in the family, of the Senate's regular Secretary, Dr. Gordon Haist (Beaufort). The Chair also announced that the Lancaster Campus has increased their representation in the Senate from four to five Senators, due to an increase in enrollment at Lancaster, and welcomed back Professor Jimmie Nunnery, who has represented Lancaster in previous years, as the added Senator. Chairperson Towler then extended a welcome to any alternate Senators who may be participating in the proceedings. Reminding Senators to identify themselves by name and campus when speaking from the floor, the Chair called for corrections to the minutes of the October 3, 1975 meeting. Professor Marnie Foster offered an address correction to the Roster of Senators. The correct address of Professor John Samaras should read: Route 9, Box 335. The Chair accepted the correction and noted in addition that the official Roster should be revised to include the name of Lancaster's new Senator, Professor Jimmie Nunnery.

Corrections to Minutes

Chairperson Towler offered a correction to page 6, line 50 of the minutes. Professor Wynn's response to Professor Wright's question concerning grievance committees on regional campuses should be amended, she said, from "no" to "not all regional campuses have grievance committees," on the basis that some campuses do have grievance committees. Professor Wynn concurred with the suggested change, explaining that although some Welfare Committees serve as grievance committees on certain campuses, it is not the case and should not be implied that all campuses have grievance committees. It should, however, be understood that some campuses do have grievance committees. No further corrections were voiced, so the minutes were approved in the form they had been sent to the Senators, and as duly corrected.

Minutes of
October 3, 1975
Approved

II. Introductions and Comments by University Officials

Chairperson Towler then called on Dr. Willard Davis, Vice-President in charge of Regional Campuses, as the first speaker.

Dr. H. Willard Davis

A. Dr. Davis discussed the University's recent budgetary problem that had been created when the state's legislature imposed an eight per-cent cut-back on operating funds for the current fiscal year. Recounting the history of the current crisis, he explained that the problem

Concerning
Budget
Matters

originated as much as two years ago when the state budgeted about one-half of its \$40 million-or-so surplus into the following year's appropriations, thus providing appropriations that would have no tax base and that would not be self-renewing. The resulting error, according to Dr. Davis, is that this procedure, when practiced on a continuing basis, creates on-going expenses that then have to be paid for out of pre-time popular monies. He pointed out that the same procedure was followed last year, and that the appropriations bill for the current fiscal year contained the assumption that there would be a surplus of a certain amount from which to draw funds. Yet the surplus generated last year was only about one-half what the legislature had anticipated it to be; with the result, he said, that the state found itself about \$20 million in the red for this year.

Dr. Davis then introduced two other factors that have also contributed to the current crisis. First, he commented that although the state's current appropriations bill was predicted on a ten per cent increase in state revenues this year, the best estimate for current revenues that the chairman of the state's tax commission can provide places the actual increase not at ten, but only at four per cent. Combining this estimate with other significant factors, Dr. Davis said, a deficit of about \$60 million on a total of one billion dollars has to be projected.

Second, Dr. Davis stated that the actual enrollment on some campuses was appreciably higher than had been projected when the state determined its appropriations to state supported institutions. By fulfilling its obligation to appropriate a fixed amount per full-time equivalency student to each campus, he said, the state added an unexpected expense of over six million dollars to its deficit. To compensate for its loss, the state then reduced its whole appropriation to university campuses by eight per cent.

Dr. Davis emphasized that the University had anticipated problems from the beginning of this fiscal year, and had already planned a five per cent reduction in the state appropriation part of its available money per campus. The University was therefore able, he reported, to reduce its budget the remaining three per cent without affecting anyone's salaries, and without seriously damaging any academic programs. He indicated, however, that it may be more difficult in the future to hire replacements, and alluded to the fact that state officials have not been as strong in their assurances as in the past concerning their intent to not encourage salary cuts or job dislocations.

Dr. Davis then paused to answer questions. There were none, so he continued his discussion of the budget situation by warning Senators that there may be more trouble next year. New appointments, he said, might be difficult to obtain even though increases in enrollment ought to justify more faculty positions.

He then explained the hierarchy for procuring funds. The hierarchy begins with requests the University makes to the Commission on Higher Education, which then makes recommendations to the state's Budget and Control Board. Recommendations from the Board go to the Legislature, whose own hierarchy begins with the House Ways and Means Committee and moves up to the Senate Finance Committee. Noting that the University would be in "great shape" if it were to receive the amount recommended by the Commission on Higher Education, Dr. Davis urged that a realistic outlook suggests, on the contrary, that the state will not have that much money and that there will be some reductions. Because the University is still growing, he said, it will have some additional money and will be able to respond to the changing situation, but he singled out two long range problems for consideration. First, he claimed that long range reductions in resources will be based on a lower base than had been planned as of last year. Second, and in addition to the financial aspects, he predicted that the University's prerogatives in the decision-making process will be more difficult to maintain once other state agencies, such as Personnel, the Budget and Control Board, and Central Purchasing, become involved in the process. He nevertheless emphasized that the state in his opinion will eventually return to a more favorable relationship with the University, such as has existed in the past.

Dr. Davis then paused a second time to answer questions from the floor.

Chairperson Towler asked Dr. Davis what amount is recommended by the Higher Education Commission for FTE on regional campuses, in comparison to the Columbia campus.

Dr. Davis responded that the Commission works on two different formulae. He stated that the three larger campuses (two of which have been moved into the formula for four year schools, and one-Aiken-which will be so moved next year) receive \$899 plus supplement, or between \$990 and \$1000 per FTE. He then explained that the formula is based on faculty salaries, using the Winthrop College faculty salary as the base for four year schools throughout the system which raises the rate to around \$1600 per FTE for Spartanburg, \$1500 for Coastal, and \$1300 for Aiken. Such variations between campuses as physical plant size and actual maintenance costs are also built into the formula. He estimated that the Columbia campus receives around \$2100 per FTE, and that the smaller campuses receive around \$930 per FTE. The procedure, he said, has been to use the same formula, but with changes in the quantities of the components, for all campuses, and to pay for the expansion of the larger campuses by adding supplements. The resulting difference between formulae is based on the assumption that it takes more to run a four year program than a two year program, just as it takes more to run graduate than undergraduate programs, he said.

There were no other questions concerning the budget situation, so Dr. Davis turned next to a discussion of the relationship between regional campuses and the University Faculty Senate. He pointed out that the process of achieving the present representation has been gradual. After a brief review of this process

cess, he directed his remarks to the debate that occurred on the floor of the last University Senate meeting concerning that Senate's authority to approve or disapprove courses and programs on all regional campuses. According to Dr. Davis, among the fifteen articles pertaining to the organization of the administration of regional campuses that had been passed during the January meeting of the Board of Trustees were articles specifically stating that: (a) regional campuses are responsible to the Board of Trustees through the President and the Vice-President in charge of regional campuses; (b) academic programs in regional campuses are to be run under the general supervision of the President and Vice-President in charge of regional campuses; and (c) regional campus faculty would be expected to declare their own requirements for degrees for approved majors. On the basis of these articles, he said, the University Senate is given neither the right nor the responsibility to approve courses and programs on regional campuses. Yet regional campuses have the right, on the basis of their representation in the University Senate, to vote their approval or disapproval of the main campus courses and programs. Acknowledging that main campus faculty had a "valid point" in objecting to this arrangement, Dr. Davis informed the Senators that he would attend the grievance committee for the main campus' New Courses and Curriculum Committee on the following Thursday, at which time he would explain the policies established by the Board of Trustees to that committee. He then presented his own view that neither regional campus nor main campus faculty ought to vote on one another's courses and programs, arguing that such programs as the Business Administration and Education programs at Coastal are distinct from other programs and requirements on other campuses.

Professor Jim Otten (Lancaster) asked how autonomous are four year programs developed on other regional campus systems of this type, assuming that there are other systems of this type.

Dr. Davis responded by describing the variations between such systems as have been developed by Pennsylvania State, Indiana University and Purdue, Wisconsin, Ohio, and North Carolina; none of which, he said, compares exactly with any other. He described his impression of the South Carolina system as having "more autonomy now even on our two year campuses than one finds at most of these other places." Despite their variations, he stated that four year campuses in other systems develop a great deal of autonomy, and he cited as examples the Birmingham and Tuscaloosa campuses of the University of Alabama, both of which have no involvement with one another's campuses even though they both report to the same Board of Trustees.

A second question from the floor asked what advantages could be given for regional campuses remaining in the University Senate.

Dr. Davis responded that there are advantages, arguing that there are still some issues in common between regional and main campuses that need to be debated with adequate representation from all areas. He cited last year's change to a different grading system as an example of a problem of mutual interest to all campuses, and cited as another example the need to handle

transfers between campuses for certain majors, such as mathematics, physics, and pharmacy.

A third question from the floor asked what alterations would it make if regional campuses pulled out of the main campus Senate. The questioner described his impression of the last University Senate's meeting, whereby he believed that the University Senate was to be understood as the faculty senate of the University. He added that "the mere fact that (regional campus representatives) were sitting in that room made it almost the faculty senate of the University and not of the main campus."

Dr. Davis responded that he felt "very strongly that it would be a mistake to get into the situation where all of our programs go through them. The needs are different and the resources are different. . . Yet I still think the two year campuses ought to stay. They're there and they don't have this problem. All this discussion applies mainly to the four year campuses."

A fourth question asked whether the University Senate has anything to do with admissions.

Dr. Davis answered that the Faculty Senate elects an Admissions Committee (the Committee, he disclosed, is partly elected and partly appointed), but does no more.

Dr. Duffy, who has served on the Committee, interjected that regional campuses have had input on the committee since 1965, and added that "they never make a move regarding the regional campuses without consulting us."

Dr. Davis then completed his answer by stating his belief that admissions would not be an area of particular concern, because he "did not believe that they would be any more inclined to get into our admission procedures than they do now." He then ended his discussion, informing Senators that he would be available for questions for the rest of the day.

B. Chairperson Towler then turned the floor over to Dr. John Duffy, Associate Vice-President for Regional Campuses, who introduced the next speaker, Ms. Sylvia Hudson, Coordinator of Student Financial Aid. Dr. Duffy noted that the Regional Campus Administration differs from almost any institute in the country because it handles financial aid. He also informed Senators that Ms. Hudson, who handles financial aid through his office, is currently President of the South Carolina Financial Aid Administrators, and has served on the regional panel in Atlanta that determines awards to be made to different schools. He described Ms. Hudson as "most knowledgeable about financial aid."

Sylvia Hudson

(Note: Ms. Hudson's speech is reprinted as Appendix I to these minutes.)

At the conclusion of her talk, Ms. Hudson commented that her office will spend \$625,000 this year, and \$125,000 in BEOC grants alone, which will exceed the amount spent for the entire 1973-74 Student Aid program.

She then yielded the floor to questions.

She answered a question regarding programs which would pay a student to go to school by stating that although students frequently refer to this type of program, she has "personally never been able to find a program available to all students to pay per hour basis." The question, she said, might be referring to some programs that exist through Manpower Development Training, which is a program whose funds had been channeled, up to a year or two ago, into technical education systems. Even though it is not a technical program, she said, "the nature of the way its policy is written seems to center it on technical education, mostly in terms of terminal one or two year programs."

Responding to questions concerning the procedure used for Basic Education Opportunity Grants, Ms. Hudson stated that these grants are wholly based on the parents' income only when the student applicant can be classified as a dependent. The student's eligibility as a dependent, she said, is based on three "clear-cut" conditions. These are:

1. The student must have lived with his parents in excess of two weeks of the year preceding the date he plans to enroll, or
2. He must be claimed by his parents as a tax deduction in the preceding year, or
3. His parents must have contributed in some way, shape or form the equivalent of \$600 to his support in the preceding year.

"The basic underlying conception of student aid," Ms. Hudson said, "is that the Federal Government does not want to assume responsibility for students when the parents are supposed to be the number one contributing factor towards their education." In other words, she explained, "you have to disprove dependency."

Ms. Hudson also explained that the means used to determine eligibility are constant throughout the nation. Variations occur between institutions rather than states, depending on such factors as the expense of attending a given institution, whether or how much the student pays for sustenance, the amount the institution expects a student to contribute from his summer savings, etc. Married students, she said, are regarded as having chosen to marry rather than to remain as dependents; and therefore are not entitled to premium sources of aid. A married dependent budget has been established, she added, which can provide income for students whose income comes from a spouse and who is living with relatives. She also said that when parents can afford, but refuse, to assist a student, the financial aid director is usually forced to work with the institution to arrange for employment or for long or short term loans.

Chairperson Towler thanked Ms. Hudson for her informative talk, and turned to the next item on the agenda.

Standing Committee Reports
Rights and Responsibilities

II. Reports from Standing Committees

A. Rights and Responsibilities Committee

Professor John Wright (Union), Chairman of the Committee, presented three motions to the Senate. The first two, he said, continue the discussion of an issue that began during the last Senate meeting (see October 3, 1975 Minutes, pp. 3-5).

These motions were:

Motion 1

1. That any faculty member who has asked to be considered for promotion and/or tenure and has not received such shall, on written request, be informed of the reason or reasons for the denial from the level or levels involved.

Motion 2

2. That above the space on the request for consideration form that the individual uses to indicate whether or not he wishes to be considered for tenure and/or promotion, the following statement shall be added to the form:

"If you wish to be notified in writing of the reason or reasons that you have not been recommended for promotion and/or tenure, please make a statement so stating below."

Both motions came to the floor from the Committee, and did not require seconds.

Motion 1 passed

The chair called for discussion on the first motion. There was none, so the motion was voted on. Motion One passed, unanimously.

At the request of the Chair, Dr. Davis then commented on Motion Two. He stated that the motion would make it difficult to follow the spirit of Plan A, and would create a problem with the Committee of Nine's attempts to safeguard confidentiality. He located the problem as one of how what is in a file gets transmitted back to the individual.

Professor Alice Henderson (Spartanburg) then described a method used in Spartanburg for voting on tenure and promotion. She suggested that such a method would allow the Committee of Nine to safeguard confidentiality and yet inform the individual of reasons for his rejection.

Professor Wright asserted that the question of safeguards is an internal one for the Committee of Nine to resolve. There was no further discussion. The Chair called for the question, and Motion Two passed, unanimously.

Motion 2 passed

Professor Wright then presented the third motion:

Motion 3

3. That all campuses will be provided with the request for consideration form, and that all directors will provide these forms for full-time faculty members.

The Chair called for discussion.

Professor Carolyn Wynn (Spartanburg) asked whether this motion provides for how the forms will be made available.

Professor Wright responded that his Committee is not questioning how, but simply that they are made available. Faculty members, he said, have the right to have access to these forms, and should be given them.

Professor Wynn asked whether this has been the practice up to the present.

Chairperson Towler responded that she believed that it has been the practice on some campuses, but that the practice has not been uniform on all campuses.

Professor Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster) reported that this issue had arisen in the small campus caucus that morning, when it was discovered that at least two campuses (Sumter and Salkehatchie) do not have these forms. The resulting discussion centered on the question of what forms were needed. Responding to questions from Dr. Davis and Dr. Duffy, Mr. Jack C. Anderson, Director of Sumter Campus, reported that the only forms used at Sumter are data-forms, but that his faculty is aware that individuals could indicate if they did not wish to be considered for promotion or tenure.

Dr. Davis then asked whether the issue concerned a form to be considered. If so, he said, no such form is needed. "Everyone", he said, "will be considered unless a written request not to be (considered) is made."

Professor Wright stated that on his and other campuses, forms have been passed around on which faculty were asked whether or not they wished to be considered.

Dr. Davis responded that this is not the correct procedure.

Chairperson Towler stated that in her opinion, some campuses are looking for a mechanism by means of which they can expedite their promotion and tenure responsibility.

Dr. Davis responded that the plan is quite simple in its present form. By a certain date, he said, every faculty member submits a file, and unless they state that they do not wish to be considered, they will be considered.

Chairperson Towler answered that she believed the motion asks for a form which gives them the right to not be considered, and Dr. Davis asserted that in that case, a simple note stating one's wishes would be sufficient.

Professor Lee Cra (Sumter) suggested that the confusion

in the small campus caucus resulted from the discovery that there was not a uniform form distributed throughout the small campuses.

Dr. Davis repeated his belief that a form is not needed when a brief note can suffice instead.

Subsequent discussion over the difference between Motion Two and Motion Three led Chairperson Towler to state, by way of clarification, that Motion Two has to do with why individuals were not promoted, whereas Motion Three has to do with a form that would go to each faculty member requesting them to check whether or not they wished to be considered.

Professor Jim Otten (Union) then stated that the assumption behind the Committee's last two motions was that there was such a form.

Dr. Davis responded that Plan A makes no reference to a form requesting consideration, but states that faculty members have the right to assert that they do not wish to be considered at that time.

Professor Wright then explained that the intent of the motions was to help faculty members correct deficiencies they might have, which the committee believed could be best realized by a written response made to them.

Motion Three
Defeated

There being no further discussion, the Chair called for the question. Motion Three was defeated.

Professor Don Weser (Sumter) then stated that he believed that the defeat of Motion Three nullified the previous two motions. "At least," he said, "Motion Two is nullified since individuals are supposed to respond by using the form referred to in Motion Three."

Professor Wynn asserted that just as an individual can insert a letter in his folder requesting that he not be considered; so, too, can he insert a letter in his folder requesting that he be informed of the results. Chairperson Towler added that then that request must be honored, on the basis of Motion Two.

Professor Weser requested that Motion Two be re-read. After the re-reading, he suggested that perhaps Motion Two should be rephrased, to the effect that the individual's request for reasons for his denial could be stated in a letter to be inserted in his file.

Dr. Duffy asserted that if on any place on the form faculty members use to update their files, an individual states that he does not wish to be considered, he will not be; otherwise, he will be considered. "Apparently," he said, "if you put your update in, you are asking to be considered."

The Chair then stated that it understood the intent of the second motion to be that "there will be a mechanism provided with which the individual can request the written reasons for not being promoted."

Professor Otten suggested that the discussion was becoming preoccupied by procedural problems. He stated that the discussion in the small campus caucus focused on two points: (1) that a need existed for faculty members to know why they were turned down; and (2) that consideration was given to how one should indicate that one wants to know. "It seems to me," he said, "that there should be a way for someone to find out why they were not considered, and to request such in writing would, I think, satisfy the intent of the motion."

Dr. Davis interjected that that could be done by providing a mechanism for reviewing someone's file after he had been rejected.

Chairperson Towler stated that Motion Two will stand unless a motion is made to the contrary. A motion was made from the floor to withdraw Motion Two, thus embroiling the Chair in a procedural debate. Motion Two had been passed unanimously and could only be withdrawn by those who had opposed it.

Motion Two
Reconsidered.

Professor Jim Otten therefore moved to reconsider Motion Two of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee. The motion was seconded and voted on. It passed unanimously, and Motion Two was brought before the floor for further consideration.

Professor Nunnery then suggested that the last sentences of the motion could be replaced by a statement saying that the person has the right to request, in writing, the reason or reasons why he was not promoted.

The Chair reminded the Senators that Motion One had already been passed, and suggested that it would satisfy the intent of the suggested revision. The Chair therefore called for the question on Motion Two. Motion Two was then defeated, unanimously. The Chair summarized the proceedings by saying that "we are so instructed that you can include in your forms to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, that if you are denied promotion or tenure, you are to be notified in writing as to the reasons."

Finally, Professor Wright informed the Senate that the Rights and Responsibilities Committee will consider the areas of student rights, course offerings and remedial programs in their next meeting, and requested Senators to provide any relevant information, if they wish, before the next Senate meeting.

Financial Concerns Committee B. Financial Concerns Committee

Professor Nancy Moore (Spartanburg) reported that her committee had three motions to present to the Senate. The first motion stated that:

1. The Financial Concerns Committee conduct a salary study, similar to what has been done in the past, but using the following variables: large and small campuses scaled by degrees, rank, sex, experience (i.e., years since the M.A. or Ph.D.), and divisions (or departments).

Most information, she said, is available from Dr. Duffy's office, although individual campus representatives on some campuses will have to obtain information on experience. Large campuses undergoing self-study, she believed, have this information available.

There being no further discussion, the motion was voted on. Motion One passed, unanimously.

Motion Two read:

2. That Dr. Duffy's office provide faculty with written notification of the general procedures used for formulating budgets.

Motion Two
Passed

There was no discussion. Motion Two passed, unanimously.

Motion Three read:

3. That Dr. Duffy urge Directors to make campus budgets available to faculty.

The Chair opened the floor to discussion.

A question was raised concerning the extent of the budget talked about by the motion. Professor Moore explained that the first motion covers salaries, while the third motion is primarily directed towards the percentages involved for faculty salaries, equipment, etc. She further explained that the intent of the Committee was not vindictive; instead, it was "to provide information that might help faculty members understand some of the constraints that administrators are under."

Dr. Duffy stated that his office could assist, so long as the motion concerned aggregate percentages, by working with the directors. Professor Moore confirmed that the motion sought aggregate percentages which the Committee hoped to use to "get an idea of proportions." She therefore did not elect to make the motion more specific.

Motion Three
Passed

There was no further discussion. Motion Three was voted on and passed, unanimously.

Intra-University Services and Communication Committee

C. Intra-University Services and Communication Committee

Professor Judy Sessions (Salkehatchie) reported that her Committee had no motions to make, but that work on the Speaker's Bureau was progressing.

III. Special Committee Reports.

A. Columbia Library Committee--Dr. Conway Henderson (Spartanburg)

Dr. Henderson stated that he had not received notification of the meeting of the Library Committee until it was too late for him to attend. He did, however, relate pertinent details of the meeting as presented in the minutes. These details concerned primarily the problems of construction which have delayed the Library's move from McKissick to the new central library. The Committee passed a motion, he said, delaying the move of all libraries until the end of Spring Semester.

B. Courses and Curricular Committee--Professor Marnie Foster (Lancaster)

Professor Foster reported that a variety of courses, course descriptions, and degree requirements had been reviewed by the Committee and approved during the November 5, 1975 main campus Faculty Senate meeting. Details of these changes, she noted, are printed in the minutes of that meeting. She also reported that the Bachelor of Science degree in Criminal Justice was approved, along with twenty new courses for the School of Criminal Justice. Matters approved by the Committee, but pending before the Faculty Senate, include:

1. Two new courses in Geology
2. Change in catalog description for B. A. in Political Science
3. One new course in English
4. Two title and description changes in Government and International Studies.

Professor Foster concluded her report by reporting that matters presently under discussion include:

1. Double majors
2. The awarding of an undergraduate degree for professional school students who have completed 90 or more hours of undergraduate work.

Following Professor Foster's report, Dr. Duffy advised Senators to make better use of her services by identifying for her the course or curriculum problems that are of special concern on different campuses. Noting that she could procure an invitation for a concerned faculty member to attend a committee meeting, he emphasized that possibilities exist through this committee for regional campus faculty to deal with course problems.

C. Columbia Faculty Welfare Committee--Dr. Harry Shealy
(Aiken)

Dr. Shealy reported that the Committee is still discussing ways for obtaining a state retirement tax shelter. He said that a type of noncontributory retirement fund is being considered, whereby an employee would pay into the retirement fund without having his contribution count as part of his gross income. The system would work, he said, by having the state actually make a contribution to the retirement fund for the employee.

D. Academic Advisory and Faculty Liaison Committee--
Professor Carolyn Wynn (Spartanburg)

No report.

IV. Unfinished Business.

There was one item of unfinished business. The Chair asked Dr. Davis to report on the Senate's request of the Provost, Dr. Keith Davis, to extend library loan privileges from three weeks to six weeks for regional campus faculty (see October 3, 1975, Minutes, p.7, Motion Two from the Intra-University Services Committee). Dr. Davis suggested that the Secretary of the Senate should write the Provost to ask what had been done. The Chair stated that the Provost had been contacted by telephone. Professor Judy Sessions stated that she had indeed called, and was informed that the Provost was taking the matter under consideration, and would be in contact with the Senate. The Chair therefore left the matter under unfinished business, to be brought up during the next meeting.

Library Loan
Extension
Postponed

V. New Business

One item of new business was on the agenda. Professor Jack Turner (Spartanburg) presented the following motion:

1. That the Senate coordinate its bi-semester meetings with the monthly main campus Senate meetings.

Professor Carolyn Wynn seconded the motion. Professor Turner argued that the cost involved in sending Senators to both meetings is a sufficient reason for coordinating meetings. Moreover, those Senators who participate in both Senates, he held, are subjected to more inconvenience than is either necessary or desirable.

Chairperson Towler pointed out that the roster of Senators for the Regional Campus Senate is not identical to the roster of Regional Campus Senators attending the main campus Senate. Savings in mileage costs would be negated, she said, by requiring Columbia meetings for Senators in main campus and regional campus Senates. Subsequent discussion concerned the feasibility of having Senators sit through two Senates on the same day. Professor Jimmie Nunnery then moved to table the motion, and Professor Judy Sessions seconded the move to table the motion. The Chair called for the question. The motion to table Motion One of New Business

passed.

No further new business was entertained.

VI. Announcements

Next Meeting:
February 13, 1976

The Chair announced that the next Regional Campus Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 13, 1976, at the Aiken Regional Campus.

Adjournment

The meeting was then adjourned.

Appendix-1

Ms. Sylvia Hudson's Report on Financial Aid on the Regional Campuses

I would like to begin by thanking the members of the Faculty Senate for extending this opportunity to me to talk with you about the world of Student Financial Aid. I have wanted to share with you this world of which I am a part because it is truly an exciting one---But more important than showing you the excitement, I have been anxious to point out to you---the faculty---where you fit into this world, I have pondered for several weeks on just what type of information you might be seeking from me. Could it be the nitty-gritty procedures involved in determining student eligibility? Could it be apprising you of the various types of Student assistance programs available. Or could you be desiring a panoramic view, that is, a sequential outline of the history, present, and future paths of student aid? You might simply be interested in the direct impact of student aid dollars on the Regional Campuses and the surrounding communities.

The time needed to thoroughly discuss each of these ideas would be entirely too lengthy for this, our first meeting. Therefore, I will be skimming the surface on many related areas of student aid---and in doing so I hope to plant within each of you a seed of continued interest and concern.

One individual at each campus can not possibly know everything about every student nor every source of student aid. Students quite often look to you, the faculty, for advice, and occasionally it is in the area of financial concerns. You hopefully have or will develop a sense of moral obligation to inform these students of the availability of Financial Aid. Please, do not misunderstand what I am saying. I certainly do not expect each faculty member to become a practicing Financial Aid Director nor to divulge information given you in confidence. What I am saying is that I do look to faculty as being a major channel for students to the Financial Aid Office.

Each campus has a Financial Aid Director who has the responsibility for determining student eligibility for a variety of programs. Many students go directly to the Financial Aid Director to seek help---Other students fail to recognize that the Financial Aid Director is capable of much more than looking at an application and giving a "yea" or "nay". We work with students--not pieces of paper.

For example---A well-trained Financial Aid Director may be able to develop or re-arrange a student's personal budget to allow for maximum utilization of his own dollars rather than obtaining dollars from federal state, or private sources.

How do we get the monies, you may be asking? The Regional Campus System has a rather unique method of obtaining her federal student aid funds. Contrary to most multi-campus systems, we submit a single application to the Office of Education on behalf of all the Regional Campuses. When funds are received, the pie is split among the campuses in varying amounts according to campus needs. This procedure enables us the flexibility of shifting funds among the campuses as needs change. We feel we are able to utilize to the maximum the federal aid dollars available. However, as in any program sponsored primarily by federal dollars, there are always more applicants than

available funds.

You may also be asking what types of programs do we have? The three college-based federal student aid programs which comprise the largest student aid monies are the NDSL program (a program of borrowing), the CWS program (a program of employment), and the SEOG program. We refer to these as "college based" programs because the Student Aid Officer has the flexibility to work with the student to determine which program or package of programs best suit that student's needs. The newest federal program, the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, currently in it's 3rd year of operation, unfortunately offers the Financial Aid Director no means of adjusting obvious errors on the student's application. This is in contrast to the previously mentioned "college based" program.

By law, the BEOG is supposed to be the foundation or floor upon which other sources of aid are to build. Again, I remind you of the lack of maneuverability afforded institutions in administering the Basic Grant. Congress has been quick to point the finger of administrative responsibility to the institutions but failed to provide the tools or mechanism which we need to carry out their demands. On the one hand students have been allowed greater access to Education thru the availability of the Basic Grant and on the other hand, they have been given another "red tape" process. Errors on applications delay the processing time and may even discourage a student to pursue his educational desires.

I see a major role of the Financial Aid Director as easing the Admission process for students. You must realize, however, we can do so only with the help of the students. Proper planning is truly an asset for any student who feels additional funds will be needed to attend a Regional Campus. I encourage parents and students to apply early for financial aid even if they think they're not eligible or may not want it later. I remind them that students always have the right to reject the financial aid offered.

Earlier, I mentioned the "Excitement" of Student Financial Aid. Students are our excitement. No two students nor financial situations are alike--- When parents, faculty, or students ask me to give them a step by step outline of my procedure for awarding financial aid, I appear to back off and stutter. "Show us the light," they say. "Tell it like it is." Surely, you are saying, that could not be too great a task---after all, that's your profession. But I say, it is a task---one which can not be performed hastily nor likewise answered lightly.

I am reminded of the fable authored by C. K. Palmer, Chief Program Officer for the Atlanta Regional Office of Education. I'd like to read it to you. It's entitled

The Chronicle of the Little Red Ant

"Once a long time ago when ant civilization was at its height, and the ants dominated the earth, there was a little red ant who was a seeker of the truth. He was advised to attend State Ant College for here he could surely learn the truth. So he packed his trunk and journeyed over the mountains and down the valley to State Ant College, where he proceeded to tell the faculty, "I have come here to learn the great truth." The faculty replied, "That is excellent, but to learn the truth you must first learn the many

things that lead to truth and we will teach these to you."

"Our little red ant studied very hard. In four years he studied grammar, mathematics, geography and various other disciplines where the many things that lead to truth were alleged to be found. During his last year, a great movement arose from the great ant hill by the Potomac for career education, and the red one extended his studies to include some courses taught by ants from the "real ant world" though he continued to confront each new professor with the same question, "Can you teach me the truth?" "Can you tell me like it is?" "Finally, graduation day came and as the faculty was gathered for the honors, the little red ant inquired of a group of the oldest and wisest among them, "What is the truth? I came here seeking the truth! You told me that there were many things that I must learn before I could learn the truth and I have studied hard and I know these things. They are very fine, but I came here to learn the truth so that I can take it back to my brothers in the ant colony beyond the valley and over the Mountains. Please tell me the truth!"

"The faculty was dismayed. They gathered into various committees and then consulted with the administration for a very long time while the little red ant waited. Finally, the oldest philosophy professor came forth to the little red ant and said, "Alas! little red one, there is no truth. What is truth here is not truth there and what is truth today will not be truth tomorrow. Truth is nothing and nothing is truth."

"The little red ant was very sad. A tear decked his left antenna and he said, "I am not sure that I can live in the absence of truth." It was a cold wintery eve in November when he ran a briar through his head."

End of Fable

I hope none of you will go to the extreme that the little red ant did because I am unable to give you "THE" truth or "THE" method of making awards to students.

Each student is different; each situation is different---no two are alike. What is done to help one student is not necessarily the path to take for another. This is the excitement of student aid: to be a part of helping a student expand his being, assisting him as he reaches for his star. As faculty members, you are quite aware of this type of soul-satisfying experience. We, you and I, do work hand-in-hand as we must work hand-in-hand. We Financial Aid Directors need your support. For it is in our joint efforts that we succeed; it is in our joint efforts that the students succeed.

As I mentioned earlier, I could only begin to skim the surface of the many facets of Student Financial Aid. I only briefly mentioned the four largest sources of Student Aid dollars---Basic Grants, ND Loans, College Work-Study, and SEO Grants. I didn't begin to tell you of the other types of available programs. For example, here in Spartanburg as in Aiken and Coastal, the Nursing Loan and Scholarship programs are of tremendous importance to their Nursing Students. Private foundations such as the Serrine Foundation and Leroy Springs have aided tremendously in opening doors for many students. The

S. C. Student Loan Corporation has just recently been created by the General Assembly to act as the lending agency for the federally insured student loans program. The list continues to grow as does the number of student applicants.

I have prepared some material for hand-out which briefly describes the major sources of student aid programs at the Regional Campuses. Also, I have included a chart showing student aid dollars awarded within the system. Hopefully, these documents may answer some of your questions which I have not addressed today.

But before distributing the material I would again like to thank you for the opportunity to share with you my views as they relate to what I hope will become a stronger effort to assist the students of the Regional Campus System.

Thank you---

Attachment A of Appendix 1

MAJOR SOURCES OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

AVAILABLE AT UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA REGIONAL CAMPUSES

1. THE BASIC EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM (BEOG) Students may apply for a Basic Grant if they are entering one of the U. S. C. Regional Campuses for the first time after April 1, 1973 and are enrolling full or part-time basis. The BEOG is not a loan but an entitlement. To apply for a Basic Grant, the student must complete a form called "Application for Determination of Basic Grant Eligibility". Copies of the application are available from each regional campus, high schools, public libraries or by writing to BEOG, Box 2468, Washington, D. C. 20013. Within 4-weeks, the student will receive status. This Report may be submitted to the Regional Campus which will calculate the amount of the Basic Grant the student is eligible to receive. During the current academic year students may qualify for as much as \$1038.

2. THE NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOAN (NDSL) is for students who are enrolled at least half-time in a participating postsecondary institution and who need a loan to meet their educational expenses.

They may borrow a total of: (a) \$2,500 if enrolled in a two-year program or if they have completed less than two years of a program leading to a bachelor's degree; (b) \$5,000 if they are an undergraduate student who has already completed 2 years of study towards a bachelor's degree. (This total included any amount borrowed under NDSL for undergraduate study.)

Repayment begins 9 months after graduation or leaving school for other reasons. The student may be allowed up to 10 years to pay back the loan. During the repayment period 3 percent interest will be charged on the unpaid balance of the loan principal.

No payments are required for up to three years while serving in the Armed Forces, Peace Corps, or VISTA.

Application is made through the institution the student is interested in attending.

3. THE SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT (SEOG) is for students of exceptional financial need who without the grant would be unable to continue their education. Students are eligible to apply if they are enrolled at least half-time as an undergraduate.

If the student receives an SEOG, it cannot be less than \$200 or more than \$1,500 a year. Normally, an SEOG may be received for up to four years. However, the grant may be received for five years when the course of study requires the extra time. The total that may be awarded is \$4,000 for a four year course of study or \$5,000 for a five year course .

If the student is selected for an SEOG, the regional campus must provide the student with additional financial assistance at least equal to the amount of the grant.

Application is made through the regional campus in which the student is interested in attending.

4. THE COLLEGE WORK-STUDY (CWS) PROGRAM provides jobs for students who have great financial need and who must earn a part of their educational expenses. Students may apply if they are enrolled at least half-time.

The educational institution which participates in College Work-Study arranges jobs on campus or off campus with a public or private non-profit agency, such as a hospital. If the student is found to be eligible, they may be employed for as many as 40 hours a week.

In arranging a job and determining how many hours a week a student may work under this program, the financial aid officer will take into account; (1) the need for financial assistance; (2) class schedule; and (3) the student's health and academic progress. In general, the salary received is at least equal to the current minimum wage.