UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MEETING

USC-LANCASTER

MINUTES: 17 February 1984

General Session

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Nunnery informed the Senate that the process for selecting members of the nominating committee was his own choice and was not intended to nor should it set a precedent for choosing members of future nominating committees.

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes

Because of the lateness of the distribution of the November 18, 1983, meeting, a motion to delay approval of those minutes until the April 13, 1984, meeting in Beaufort passed.

III. Reports from University Officers

A. Dr. John Duffy, System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education

Dr. Duffy discussed the budget and the need for full formula funding. He stressed the importance of enrollment as it plugs into the formula and cited enrollment figures, gains and losses, at the various campuses. He went on to say we are going to have to look at the adult market, weekend programs and evening programs if we are to maintain our enrollment.

Dr. Duffy stated that full formula funding is the goal of the administration and under no circumstances does the administration want to see anyone break ranks by going after small bucks. Dr. Duffy also stated that an amendment has been introduced stopping funding for off-campus programs in undergraduate education without the approval of the Board and legislative delegation from the area in question. All programs now in existence, which includes the Hardeeville program, are grandfathered.

The System Vice President reported that the Summit Fund Drive is going well on all campuses. He also

announced the reorganization of a committee to be chaired by J. T. Myers for a Systemwide conference on social studies for scholarly presentation.

Dr. Duffy also announced efforts to promote a System approach in the following areas:
1) libraries
2) department meetings
3) faculty support for research

He also suggested an endowment to support staff persons in attending USC classes.

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

The Associate Vice President announced the search for the position of Dean at the Union campus will follow the same procedure and committee make-up as the Beaufort Dean's search. The one exception will be that the Associate Vice President will chair the search committee instead of the President of the Faculty Organization.

Professor Gardner announced that two Systemwide faculty meetings will be held this year. He also informed the Senate that Instructional Services Center wants to do more to support the instructional needs of the University Campuses faculty. To alleviate the fear of the cost of services, Instructional Services will provide services free of charge and Dr. Duffy's office will pay all travel expenses. Anyone interested in taking advantage of this opportunity should go through normal channels and then to Professor Gardner's office.

Professor Dockery (Lifelong Learning) inquired if this service would extend to the filming of a pig killing in North Carolina. Professor Gardner was unsure on this point.

In addressing the Faculty Exchange Program, Professor Gardner reported that $200,000 worth of requests were made for $100,000 of funds. The awards were made as follows:

	AWARDED	REQUESTS
Beaufort	(3)	(3)
Salkehatchie	(1)	(1)
Lancaster	(2)	(2)
Sumter	(5)	(8)
Aiken	(3 or 4)	(11)

He also stated that next fall more precise guidelines for applying for Faculty Exchange will be set.

Professor Gardner reported that after some work by University officials, University Campuses are eligible for desegregation money through CHE. Union, Beaufort, and Salkehatchie have submitted proposals.

Professor Gardner announced that the Assembly of System Librarians will be meeting with the Provost and Director of Libraries to discuss improving library delivery systemwide. He also announced that the campus tours, the Conference on the Freshman Year Experience, and the name change of our University Campus System were all successful.

The Associate Vice President reported that 15-hour Columbia-based course requirement has been waived for the expanded BAIS program. However, he stated that we need to keep a low profile on this with no advertisement of that change.

Professor Gardner thanked the Senate and the faculties it represents for support of the provisional year program and thus saving the jobs of people in Applied Professional Sciences.

The Associate Vice President then accepted questions from the floor:

Professor Bob Costello (Sumter) asked if the administration had set forth a written proposal or procedure for Dean selection. Professor Gardner stated that the procedure which had been used in the past would be used at Union with the committee submitting three names to the System Vice President.

Professor Don Curlovic (Sumter) questioned the philosophy of having two students on the committee thus equalling the number of faculty members on the committee. Professor Rod Sproatt (Beaufort) commented that the two students who served on the Dean's selection committee at Beaufort have never spent one day on the Beaufort Campus as a student since the new Dean has taken office. Professor Ed Caine (Beaufort) questioned the fractionalized nature of the search committee.

Professor Curlovic requested more information concerning the Faculty Exchange Program selection process. The Associate Vice President replied that the program was not designed to purely support research. The good of the institution is also a factor.

IV. Reports from Standing Committees

A. Rights and Responsibilities
Professor Joan Taylor (Beaufort) reporting for
Professor Rick Boulware (Beaufort):

Professor Taylor presented three items for the Senate's consideration:

1) Change of wording of the affirmative action statement by the University. The Rights and Responsibilities Committee through correspondence from their chairman to the Provost investigated what the Committee deemed to be a weakening of the affirmative action statement. The proposed statement read: "The policy and practice of the University of South Carolina System is that equal opportunity in education and employment be provided to all qualified persons regardless of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability."

Systemwide attention was focused on this matter and, as a result, the Board of Trustees passed the following wording of an affirmative action statement which appears in all new Faculty Manuals: "The University of South Carolina System is committed to the policy and practice of affirmative action and equal opportunity in education and employment for all qualified persons regardless of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability."

NOTE: Please see Appendices A-D from Professor Rick Boulware and the University Affirmative Action Officer Jane Jameson.

2) The Rights and Responsibilities Committee would like to go on record as supporting the efforts of the Welfare Committee in their salary summary and register official inquiry as to when copies of this report will be distributed.

3) The University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee submitted changes in the Tenure and Promotion procedure to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee (see February 13, 1984, correspondence from Professor Tandy Willis to Professor Boulware) to be presented to the University Campuses Senate for consideration.

The three changes proposed are that applicants for tenure and/or promotion include the following in their files:

1) A copy of their Dean's letter of support or non-support of their application.

2) A copy of their local Tenure and Promotion Committee's letter of support or non-support, including the voting record of that Committee in the following format: #FOR, #AGAINST, #ABSTAIN
3) The Standard Tenure and Promotion Form. (See Appendix E for proposed standard form).

Concerning the change to the new standard form, the Rights and Responsibilities Committee unanimously endorsed this motion for the following reasons:
1) it promotes consistency of format, and
2) it organizes material according to criteria in the Manual.

Discussion:

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter) observed that he would have reservations on voting on a form that is critical to faculty interests without seeing a copy of the new form.

NOTE: Because of technical problems it was not possible to distribute copies of the new form to the Senators.

Professor Bob Group (Salkehatchie) stated that the change in form is only one of format and not invariance with the criteria in the Manual.

Professor Castleberry inquired, and was informed, that the members of the Tenure and Promotion strongly supported this change, and he then withdrew the objections raised by his previous observation of the matter.

The motion to accept the new Standard Promotion and Tenure Form passed by a voice vote.

Professor Taylor presented in the form of a motion, point 1 of the three changes concerning tenure and promotion procedures, the inclusion of the Dean's letter in the applicant's file.

Discussion:

Professor Castleberry stated that on his campus the Dean's letter of support or non-support is included in the applicant's file and is sent through channels, but the applicant does not see the letter.

Dr. Duffy read from page 22 of the Faculty Manual, "By January 5, the Dean of the University will forward the files and his/her recommendations to the Office of the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing

Education for review by the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee," and stated "if we are not doing that we are violating the Manual."

Dr. Duffy continued by saying that if letters have not been in the file that it is a matter of administrative oversight that he would be glad to correct . However, the intent of the motion is already covered by the Manual.

Professor Taylor inquired if this was an unnecessary motion and the Chair ruled that it was.

Professor Dockery stated he would like to call to Dr. Duffy's attention that on page 21 of the Manual it states, "Each faculty member who wishes to be considered (for tenure and promotion) must complete the tenure and promotion file form," and that there was one whole campus that did not complete the tenure and promotion file form.

Professor Taylor then presented the third item concerning tenure and promotion by stating, "A motion is being presented now, but because it has implications for individual campus policies and procedures, we wish to introduce the motion now to be voted on in the Beaufort meeting."

The motion read as follows:

A copy of their local Tenure and Promotion Committee's letter of support or non-support, including the voting format: #FOR, #AGAINST, #ABSTAIN be included in the applicant's file.

Professor Stine (Lifelong Learning) asked for a point of clarification inquiring if the committee was introducing a motion now that would not actually be voted on until the next meeting.

The Chair explained that the committee anticipated this would be a substantive matter and therefore would have to be an agenda item for the next meeting.

Professor Castleberry asked, "Not all campuses currently have what I believe you are referring to as the local tenure and promotion committee, how would this relate to that issue?"

Professor Taylor: "That is the question we (the committee) were unsure of the answer. The Chair stated that passage of the motion would put the item on the agenda for the Beaufort meeting."

Professor Castleberry continued, "I'm afraid I failed to express myself adequately, if at some point in the future this motion is passed using this current wording do we interpret that as mandating the existence of a local tenure and promotion committee on each campus including Sumter which does not currently have such a committee?"

The Chair replied, "If this body in its wisdom passed this motion at the Beaufort meeting, the motion as presently made, then yes it would have been mandated."

Professor Ed Caine (Beaufort) "It is my understanding that we are not voting to mandate anything today, only whether or not to discuss the issue and vote on it at the Beaufort meeting."

The Chair replied that understanding was correct. The Chair ruled that the motion would be put on the agenda for the Beaufort meeting to be voted on.

Professor Tom Powers (Sumter) stated, "For the information of the committee, I do not know whether this was intended or not, but under the standing rules of the new Manual, 'the Senate shall not give final consideration to any substantive legislative matters not included on the published agenda of the meeting at which introduced, unless by a two-thirds vote the Senate shall agree to consider such matters,' there is a loop hole if it is desired."

Professor Taylor, "The committee does not desire to use it, but thank you."

Professor Group asked if a member of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, perhaps Tandy Willis, could explain what the committee hoped to gain by passage of the motion.

Professor Willis replied that it would standardize and therefore simplify the procedure while at the same time provide the committee with discrete sources of information about the candidate to compare.

Professor Curlovic observed that if the motion passed it would require a change in the Manual since the Manual provides for other options besides a faculty or peer committee for tenure and promotion. He then asked if any consideration had been given to doing away with the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee

during the discussion by the Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

Professor Taylor replied, "No."

B. Welfare Committee

Professor Marnie Foster (Lancaster) reported that the committee's deliberations were taken up by the salary survey and asked Professor Castleberry, Chair of the subcommittee working on the survey, to report on the progress of the study.

Professor Castleberry reported that the salary study is continuing and that the committee hopes to have a report ready for the Beaufort meeting.

C. Intra-University Services and Communications Committee

Professor Costello thanked the Senate for its cooperative effort in securing a name change for our system and made the following report:

"The Committee in today's meeting continued its exploration of the roles of the University Campuses in their respective local communities and within the System."

V. Report from Executive Committee

Professor Sally Johns (Lifelong Learning) reported that the Executive Committee met in Columbia on Friday, 3 February 1984. Items discussed include the following:

-- inclusion of the University Campuses as eligible for funding under the Desegregation Plan
-- status of the Faculty Manual
-- status of the salary study
-- procedure for appointment to and composition of search committees for deans
-- procedure for awarding Faculty Exchange stipends
-- agenda for 17 February Senate meeting

VI. Reports from Special Committees

A. University Library Committee

Professor Sherre Dryden (Salkehatchie) reported that the Committee had not met.

B. University Curricula and Courses Committee

Professor Johns reported that the Curricula and Courses Committee has met three times: 16 January, 23 January, and 13 February.

Action taken includes the following:

-- Approval of new courses ARTH 542
CHIN 103
GERM 111X
CRJU 511
CRJU 562
PEDU 555
-- Deletion from the Columbia Bulletin of PRSC 171, 172, 174, 271, 272, 281, and 282 (all courses in the discontinued two-year criminal justice program) and CRJU 332, 333, and 435
-- Changes in title, description, and/or prerequisites of ANTH 205
MATH 501
MATH 502
MSCI 581
GEOL 581
-- Approval of extensive revision of course offerings and curricula in English (The revision approved by Curricula and Courses had been sent to University Campus Deans for their comments and suggestions in August 1983 and again in December 1983.)

Other items discussed include:

-- The Provisional Year Program proposal as revised by the Columbia Faculty Senate Steering Committee
-- The question of to what extent a college or department should be allowed to exclude students other than majors from a given course or group of courses.

C. University Faculty Welfare Committee

Professor Dockery reported that a report will be presented at the Beaufort meeting.

D. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee

Professor Harold Sears (Union) reported that the Liaison Committee has met twice: On December 8, a Ph.D. program in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology was proposed by the College of Health, a request to institute a baccalaureate degree program in real estate was presented by the College of Business Administration, and revised Faculty Manuals for both the Columbia Campus and the University Campuses were discussed. All these matters were recommended for approval to the full Board of Trustees.

On February 2, the Department of Music proposed that its name be changed to the School of Music, a proposal to develop a statewide Center for

Gerontology was discussed, and the College of Pharmacy proposed the development of an entry level pharmacy doctorate and requested permission to confer a four-year B.S. in Pharmacy. These matters were also recommended for approval.

E. Academic Forward Planning Committee

Professor Caine reported that the Academic Forward Planning Committee met on 27 January and discussed the attributes of "outstanding universities." Our conclusions included:

1) A committee to gather information on the attributes of quality institution is not needed--the AFP can sit in that capacity.
2) Manipulation of campus entrance requirements will not increase the number of quality and motivated students. Such action would remove the less prepared students from our University, and these are the students that a state-supported university should serve. Quality students do not choose a school based on entrance requirements.
3) A uniform program of course requirements would consolidate the various campuses into a cohesive System. Certain disciplines then could be targeted for system-wide emphasis. An initial step in implementing a uniform program throughout the System could be a uniform core.
4) Graduate courses should be offered on all University Campuses. Faculty for these courses should be members of the System-wide graduate faculty. Compensation for these courses should be the same percentage of base salary as if the course were taught on the Columbia campus.

Discussion:

Professor Lila Meeks (Beaufort) asked what was the context in which point two was made?

Professor Caine replied that the committee looked at playing games with the admission requirements by having a three-tiered system with University Campuses admission requirements the lowest, Regional Campuses in the middle, and the Columbia Campus having the highest requirements. However, the Admissions Committee told them (AFPC) that it would not work.

Professor Billy Cordray (Salkehatchie) asked if the AFPC recommendation for a common core would address the problem of Aiken having certain

requirements in Business Administration while Columbia has a different set of requirements thus creating problems for students and faculty on University Campuses.

Professor Caine replied that this is exactly the intent and thrust of the recommendation.

F. University Systems Committee

Professor Nunnery reported.

See Appendix F.

Discussion:

Professor Caine asked, "Does this mean our #1 priority is to push for full formula funding, for which the money is not there, and our #1 priority is no longer to push for salaries for which the money is not there?"

Dr. Duffy replied by stating, "The issue of full formula funding is certainly related to salaries, but what the President is talking about, he is talking specifically to those of us who operate with the Legislature. Full formula funding is our priority, this University's priority. There really is no possibility of lobbying the legislature on the matter of salaries of the University. That is normally done, if it's lobbied at all, by state associations."

The Chair commented, "State associations and others."

Dr. Duffy replied, "Yes , but what I'm saying is that the University does not lobby on that salary issue to the extent we lobby on the total appropriations package."

G. University Research and Productive Scholarship Committee

Professor Powers reporting for Professor J. T. Myers (Sumter). During the Fall semester 6 proposals were received from University Campuses. Three were funded.

The Venture Fund welcomes proposals that are in a broad spectrum of areas, including teaching. Professor Myers will speak to any who are interested in submitting an internal grant proposal.

APPENDIX A

2184

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AT BEAUFORT
800 CARTERET STREET
P.O. BOX 1007
BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA 29902

November 21, 1983

(803) 524-7112

Dr. Francis T. Borkowski
Senior Vice President for
Academic Affairs and Provost
University of South Carolina
Columbia, S. C. 29208

Dear Dr. Borkowski:

The Rights and Responsibilities Committee of the Two-Year Campuses Faculty Senate has just completed the revision of the Two-Year Campuses Faculty Manual, and the manual, as I understand, is now on its way to the USC Board of Trustees for final approval.

At the last Faculty Senate Meeting, the Rights and Responsibilities Committee noted the following changes to be made in the Faculty Manual:

Page 7 — Change description of System Affirmative Action Officer to read, "The System Affirmative Action Officer is appointed by the President of the University. This individual is responsible for planning, developing, administering, and evaluating Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity policies and practices to insure compliance with federal and state statutes relating to non-descrimination in employment and education." Delete the second paragraph of the System Affirmative Action Officer description.

Page 12 — Change Affirmative Action Policies to read, "The policy and practice of the University of South Carolina System is that equal opportunity in education and employment be provided to all qualified persons regardless of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age or disability." (1)

In order that the Rights and Responsibilities Committee be better informed and so that this Committee may report to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting, would your office please provide us with the answers to the following questions regarding these changes to be made?

When were these changes made?

What prompted these changes to be made?

What are the implications of these changes?

Your concern and attention to this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

Rick D. Boulware

Rick D. Boulware, Chairman
Rights and Responsibilities Committee
Two-Year Campuses Faculty Senate

RDB/lcg

cc: Dr. John Duffy
Jane M. Jameson

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

SYSTEM AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OFFICE

December 2, 1983

Rick D. Boulware, Chair
Rights and Responsibilities Committee
Two-Year Campuses Faculty Senate
USC-Beaufort
P. O. Box 1007
Beaufort, S.C. 29902

Dear Professor Boulware:

Your letter to Provost Borkowski concerning revisions to the Affirmative Action portions of the Two-Year Campuses Faculty Manual has been referred to me for response.

The changes, which I consider to be positive ones, have been made over a period of years as the scope of responsibility for affirmative action has increased to include students as well as faculty, administrators, staff and the public. The Affirmative Action Officer does much more than the description in the current Faculty Manual: "...coordinating the implementation of the Affirmative Action Plan...by monitoring goals and timetables..." The revised description speaks to planning, developing, administering, and evaluating affirmative action policies and practices in employment and education (emphasis added) and connotes more energy and positive activity than "coordinates" and "monitors." The second paragraph was deleted because its contents are inherent in the first paragraph.

The change to the Affirmative Action Policy statement is the result of a telephone call from the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs advising that the statement in the 1978 Columbia Campus Faculty Manual is incorrect. Recognizing that the Faculty Manual does not have space to print the entire Affirmative Action Policy, the first revision was based upon a sample policy statement from the South Carolina Commission on Human Affairs. I have revised the policy statement further so that it should now read, "The University of South Carolina System is committed to the policy and practice of equal opportunity in education and employment for all qualified persons regardless of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability."

As you can see, implications of the revisions to affirmative action-related portions of the Faculty Manual are positive ones. Should you desire further clarification, please do not hesitate to call me at 7-2218.

Sincerely,

Jane M. Jameson

Jane M. Jameson
System Affirmative Action Officer

jc

cc: President Holderman
Provost Borkowski
System Vice-President Duffy

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA AT UNION

P. O. Drawer 729
UNION, SOUTH CAROLINA 29379

February 13, 1984

Mr. Rick D. Boulware
USC-Beaufort
P. O. Box 1007
Beaufort, South Carolina 29902

Dear Rick:

The University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee would like for the Rights and Responsibilites Committe of the Faculty Senate to consider recommending changes in the present Tenure and Promotion Form so that the form reflects more accurately than it now does the criteria listed in our Faculty Manual (p.21). Would your committee consider recommending the following Standard Tenure and Promotion Form?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tandy R. Willis
Secretary, University Campuses
Tenure and Promotion Committee

cc: Dr. John J. Duffy
Gordon Sproul
Jimmie Nunnery

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA AT UNION

P. O. Drawer 729
UNION, SOUTH CAROLINA 29379

February 13, 1984

Mr. Rick D. Boulware
USC-Beaufort
P. O. Box 1007
Beaufort, South Carolina 29902

Dear Rick:

The 1983-84 University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee would like to ask that the University Campuses Faculty Senate consider a recommendation we felt should come from your committee (Rights and Responsibilities).

We would like to request that, in the future, all applicants for tenure and/or promotion include the following in their files:

1. A copy of their Dean's letter of support or non-support of their application.
2. A copy of their local Tenure and Promotion Committee's letter of support or non-support, including the voting record of that committee in the following format: # FOR, # AGAINST, # ABSTAIN.
3. The Standard Tenure and Promotion Form.

I believe Gordon Sproul has contacted you about this subject. Thanks you for handling this matter.

Sincerely,

Tandy R. Willis
Secretary
University Campuses
Tenure and Promotion Committee

cc: Gordon Sproul
Jimmie Nunnery

Revised form

APPENDIX E

STANDARD TENURE AND PROMOTION FORM

A. PERSONAL DATA

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

EDUCATION (including graduate work since last degree)

List educational institutions attended subsequent to secondary school.

College, University, etc.	Location		From		To		Degrees and Major Field of Study
	City	State	Mo.	Yr.	Mo.	Yr.	

PERTINENT WORK EXPERIENCE (including teaching elsewhere)

Date Title Duties

RECORD AT USC-

ACTION (State whether original appointment, rank, title, promotion, tenure, etc.)

DATE

TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES (Courses, preparations, and contact hours by type--lecture, lab, etc.)

FACULTY MEMBER'S PERSONAL STATEMENT (Optional; a letter from applicant to explain or clarify anything on this form and/or to finish any additional information.)

B. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

Each applicant for tenure and/or promotion should address the following criteria, with documentation where appropriate.

1. Effectiveness as a Teacher or Librarian (including recent student evaluations where appropriate)
2. Campus Activities
3. Community Service
4. Professional Growth and Experience (including professional activities and membership)
5. Research and/or Scholarship (including publications)

Sign or Initial Date

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AT LANCASTER

POST OFFICE BOX 370
LANCASTER, SOUTH CAROLINA 29720
(803) 285-7471
(803) 777-6877

REPORT TO UNIVERSITY SYSTEMS SENATE MEETING OF FEB. 17, 1984

Greater USC Systems Committee
Jimmie E. Nunnery

Meeting of December 1983

1. Budget - The big push is on for full formula funding. We are losing good people due to low salaries and other results of not receiving F.F.F. now. We are to push for F.F.F., regardless of where the money comes from. THe fact was recognized, however, that, unless the one cent sales tax was approved, there would not be sufficient funds for F.F.F. in that most freed-up funds would most likely be funneled into secondary education. Thus, insufficient funds would be left for F.F.F. of higher education.

2. Placement of tenured faculty in College of A.PR.SC. - This matter, as well as the program to handle 250 students in a special program, was discussed. These matters were to come before the Columbia Campus Senate at the next meeting of that body. Our campuses were asked to give all support possible to the position taken by the College of Applied Professional Sciences.

3. The "Two-Year Campus Handbook" and the name of the two-year campus system was discussed. The recommendation of this body (our Senate) with respect to name change to reflect our now changed mission and role, as well as the fact that we all are now major cultural resources for our communities and regions, was discussed.

President Holderman pointed out most emphatically that he agreed with our position, (the motion passed by this body relative to this matter), and that, in accordance with action taken by this senate, the new name of the "Duffy Empire" was now University System Campuses. The new manual, as well as Emperor Duffy's office, Emperor Duffy's title, Associate Emperor Gardner's title, would all be changed to reflect the new name and status.

4. THe matter of state funds being used for permanent improvement on non-Columbia capuses, i.e. for buildings, repairs to buildings, and/or major equipment, was discussed. It was duly noted that S.C. state law made it quite clear that where such money was used that the property must be deeded to the state, meaning the University of S.C., and further that a lease would not

work. (Further discussion of this matter during meeting of Feb. 1, 1984.)

5. Summit Fund Drive - Based on all reports, the Summit Fund Drive is making great progress. A number of specific examples were cited that included Lancaster, Beaufort, Aiken, And Thomas Cooper Library at USC-Columbia. Some deans and chancellors from other campuses made comments as to their progress.

6. Commencements - President Holderman pointed out the necessity to coordinate and set datesfor commencements prior to the next meeting of the Systems Committee.

Meeting of Feb. 1, 1984

1. Commencement dates were announced:
   a. Coastal - Sat.,May 5, at 10 a.m.
   b. Sumter - Tues., May 8, at 7 p.m.
   c. Lancaster - Wed., May 9, at 8 p.m.
   d. Aiken - Thurs., May 10, at 7:30 p.m.
   e. Columbia - Sat. May 12, at 9:30 a.m.
   f. Beaufort - Sat. May 12, at 7:30 p.m.
   g. Union - Sun., May 13, at 3 p.m.
   h. Salkehatchie - Mon., May 14, at 7:30 p.m.
   i. Spartanburg - Fri., May 18, at 7:30 p.m.

2. President Holderman stated that there were plans in "The White House" for some money for higher education. (No further information available on this at this time.)

3. A memo of the S.C. Commission on Higher Education was handed out and discussed. The most objectionable part of the memo was an attachment that would, if approved, amend Code of Laws of South Carolina, Sect. 59-103-110. The new section would then read, in part, as follows: "No public institution of higher learning and no area commission of higher or technical education shall contract for, accept a donation of, or otherwise use or accept the ownership or benefit of any physical facilities, unless such contract, acceptance, or use has been approved by the Commission."
U.S.C. will oppose this proposed amendment first before the Commission. If unsuccessful there, it will oppose it by every possible means in the S.C. General Assembly.

4. The new credit transfer policy explained to us last year by Provost Borkowski and adopted by U.S.C. is causing us many problems with C.H.E., and, as a result, there will be some changes. In short, what they want is as follows: Once we have approved a course from an individual technical college, it is then approved at and from all technical colleges and not from only the approved seven. This U.S.C. cannot accept. A compromise is being prepared.

5. Other matters that bore directly on the University System campuses as a result of another decision by C.H.E. are as follows:

a. We were excluded from the Administrative Internship Program.

b. We were excluded from receiving desegregation funds.

Both of these exclusions were promptly and successfully opposed by U.S.C. administration. We are now eligible for consideration under both. Certain institutions of the state have not used a total of $170,000 plus in desegregation funds, and these funds are now available and will be awarded, based on new applications.

6. Contract between U.S.C. and campuses - President Holderman stated emphatically that the law specifically stated that any building, which was built in whole, or in part, by state funds and to which a local commission held title, must be deeded to U.S.C. at once and that a lease was not acceptable. There was some discussion on the lease point. The legal department stated that the law did, in fact, allow for a long-term lease with a reversion clause. Pres. Holderman stated again that all campuses must be in compliance with this law as written and that campuses not in compliance must take immediate action.

7. Budget - President Holderman stated that a new forecast was due out Monday (Feb. 6), and that this could cause problems in that this was to be the final budget, as opposed to the senate getting another one after they get the General Appropriations bill. (It is my understanding that this has now been changed, and that the senate will, in fact, get a revised forecast, as usual.) Pres. Holderman alsopointed out that all Higher Education needs 18 million more to be brought up to Full Formula Funding and that F.F.F. was the minimum that was needed.

8. The Provost made the point that C.H.E. now wants the right to control local, meaning our, foundations, and, if they got this desired control, no foundation could accept even a gift without C.H.E. approval. The president and the provost emphasized that this must be stopped, if not in the commission, then in the Legislature.

9. Summit Fund - Pres. Holderman reported that the Summit Fund was progressing nicely and could hit 60 million this year.

The next scheduled meeting of the Systems Committee is February 29, at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J. E. N.

Jimmie E. Nunnery