

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

NOVEMBER 30, 1984

USC-SUMTER
SUMTER, SC

Informal Session

Deans' Remarks:

Dean Jack Anderson (Sumter) welcomed the Senate to the Sumter Campus and announced the upcoming groundbreaking for the new Humanities and Health Sciences Building.

Dean Ron Tuttle (Beaufort) announced that Lila Meeks had been elected by the faculty of USC-Beaufort to remain as Acting Associate Dean for Academic Affairs for two more years.

Associate Dean David Bell for Dean Pete Arnold (Lancaster), conveyed the regrets of Dean Pete Arnold for his unavoidable absence, necessitated by two pressing community commitments. He announced that USC-Lancaster had celebrated its 25th anniversary in October, and that a luncheon in tribute to the campus's interdisciplinary honors program would be held in the coming week. Lee Cox of the South Carolina Committee for the Humanities was the scheduled guest speaker for the luncheon.

Dean John May (Lifelong Learning) announced that Mary Ann Camp would be leaving University employment at the end of the semester and that she would be replaced on the Senate by Linda Holderfield. He further noted that enrollments for the second eight-week term at Fort Jackson were up, while the course offerings remain constant.

Dean Ken Davis (Union) reported that USC-Union was continuing to address its enrollment problem through a marketing plan and increased student activities. Among the latter are a student newspaper, a group of girls called the Carolina Coeds, a cultural events series, and a ski trip to North Carolina. Efforts to develop a computer-assisted instruction program continue.

Dean Carl Clayton (Salkehatchie) and part of the Salkehatchie delegation were unavoidably detained, so there was no report from that campus.

The Chair, Senator Sally Johns (Lifelong Learning), announced that the location for lunch had been changed from Dana's to the Holiday Inn.

The Senate recessed, and members dispersed to attend the meetings of their respective committees.

GENERAL SESSION

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Johns called the meeting to order.

II. Correction/Approval of Minutes: 28 September 1984 USC-Columbia Columbia, SC

The MINUTES of the Senate meeting of September 28, which was held in Columbia, were not distributed until the time of this Senate meeting, so correction and approval of them was postponed until the February Senate meeting.

III. Reports from University Officers

A. Carol Bonnette (Manager, Benefits and Records, USC Personnel Services, USC-Columbia) provided the Senate with information on the current benefits program and potential new programs. Members desiring additional information or clarification may contact Ms. Bonnette at 777-6650.

B. Dr. John J. Duffy (System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education) was unable to meet with the Senate.

C. Professor John N. Gardner (Associate Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education) began by emphasizing that his report should be considered as coming from both the Vice President and himself.

He reported that the preliminary recommendations of the Budget and Control Board to the General Assembly recommended that the USC System be funded at approximately 98% of full formula funding. This, he noted, was very close to the 100% which the University had requested.

The Budget and Control Board has recommended an 8% salary increase for all state employees. Previously, classified employees have received a fixed cost-of-living raise at the beginning of the fiscal year plus a varying merit increase awarded at any of several "review dates" throughout the year. This year, the entire package is to be awarded on merit alone for both classified and unclassified employees. The money will not become available for unclassified employees until January 1, 1986, which means that there would be no raise in July of 1985. What this adds up to is an increase of 4% during the next fiscal year. Further, the University is never funded for the full amount of the state raise package, but normally is given around 70% of the total increase. Guidelines for the distribution of the increase, including the acceptable ranges of merit, have not yet been established. Professor

Gardner reiterated that no one is automatically entitled to a merit increase, and that merit increases could vary dramatically from individual to individual.

Although the University is recommended for nearly full formula funding, this does not mean that campuses will get more money this year than last. The formula is enrollment-driven, so increases and decreases in funding will roughly parallel increases and decreases in Fall 1984 enrollments. Professor Gardner emphasized, "It is very important that we remind ourselves of the continuing stake that everyone of us has in enrollment and student recruitment and student retention, because that is what drives the formula. We just cannot stress that enough!"

Professor Gardner complimented the Assembly of University and Four-Year Campus Librarians for its work in developing an on-line catalog system. He reported that the Provost has decided to put together a System On-Line Catalog Committee to study this issue. "This is really the wave of the future," he stated, "and this is a tremendous step forward."

The Beaufort and Sumter Campuses have been involved in extensive discussions with the local technical college officials and staff members from the Commission on Higher Education regarding the subject of cooperation between contiguous University Campuses and Technical School Campuses. Reports from these meetings include recommendations for increased cooperation in the areas of library, continuing education, student services, and maintenance. As a result of these discussions and reports, the question of merging USC University Campuses with TEC Campuses has been effectively laid to rest, for the moment at least. Professor Gardner complimented Deans Lisk and Anderson for their fine work in this matter.

The Associate Vice President announced that the USC System Committee on Regional Studies, chaired by Professor J. T. Myers of USC-Sumter, is sponsoring a conference at USC-Aiken on March 1 and 2. He commended this project, and praised the "strongly demonstrated interest in scholarship and these kinds of professional presentations" which the faculty of the University Campuses shows.

Professor Gardner noted that he and Vice President Duffy accepted the resignation of Senator Mary Ann Camp "with great regret," adding, "Mary Ann has been a real champion for the needs of you faculty on all our campuses and she has really forced us, as have your other librarian colleagues, to deal with a lot of your needs, and I think some great improvements have been made as a result." He reported that David Hunter is filling Senator Camp's place at the Library Processing Center on an interim basis, and that the administration was undertaking a national search, "investing the same kind of resources in terms of time and energy and finances that we would for one of

our senior dean positions," to locate an appropriate formally appointed successor. "This is a critical position to the welfare of the entire University System and to the Librarianship profession, so we are approaching that very seriously." A search committee, including "significant numbers of faculty," will make three recommendations to the Office of the Vice President, "and we will select one of those."

Associate Vice President Gardner also announced that the administration was instituting a search for a library cataloger in the Library Processing Center. Filling this new position should enhance the ability of the center to respond to the needs of the faculty and libraries of the System.

The follow-up on last year's salary study has not been forgotten. The Senate's Welfare Committee has requested information from the administration about how last year's salary recommendations were implemented. Professor Gardner reported that his office was working now on gathering that information, and that requests for data had been forwarded to many offices in the University System. He continued, "It is my intent to have the report that I'm working on in Professor Labyak's hands in time for review by the February meeting of that committee of this body for you to do with whatever you deem appropriate."

Faculty Exchange applications are down from last year. Responses to applications should be shortly after Christmas.

Professor Gardner reported that the Lightsey Commission had divided itself into two subcommittees, and that Dean Ron Tuttle was chair of one of them. He asked Dean Tuttle to report on his subcommittee.

Dean Tuttle responded that his subcommittee had sent questionnaires to all deans, chancellors, department chairs, and other unit heads in the University System. The questionnaires ask where the institutional group or unit plans to go in the next five to ten years. Responses are due by December 3. After studying these responses, the committee will visit each campus, beginning in February, and will conduct hearings with all the constituent groups of the campuses, and "will listen to whatever input those groups wish to make into the final report."

Professor Gardner reported that the other subcommittee of the Commission, of which he is a member, is looking at "the curricular natures of the relationship between the campuses in the System" He noted that much time was being spent on organization and definition of purpose. He added, "we are seeing in our Office a tremendously increased expression of interest by Columbia faculty and Columbia administrators on what we are doing on the Campuses. A lot of that expression is positive; some of it causes us some concern. For example,

some of the departments are expressing for the first time some interest in meeting with their colleagues on System Campuses. I think they are beginning to realize that we have a sleeping giant out here and they are becoming aware that the historic feeding pattern from our campuses to Columbia is a pattern that has undergone a rather radical metamorphosis in the past few years. On the other hand, some faculty are communicating to us an increased concern about the number of 300 and 400 level courses we are offering on the University Campuses, and particularly whether or not faculty who are teaching those courses have been approved to teach them, and whether or not they should be teaching them. Needless to say, we are having some rather delicate discussion about who determines who teaches what on what campus and this is something obviously that the Lightsey Commission is going to be taking a look at. I think Ron and I are both very optimistic as for the ultimate outcome of this report and its impact on our campuses."

Professor Gardner praised the efforts of the campuses in the Summit Fund drive, and noted that the solicitation had uncovered considerable support for and good will toward the University System all throughout the state.

He complimented USC-Lancaster on the "truly elegant affair" with which it celebrated its 25th anniversary.

In response to a request by the Senate, Dr. Duffy and Professor Gardner's Office is working on a report comparing the persistence of branch student and regularly admitted students. "We hope to have a report for you before too much longer."

Professor Gardner commented upon a report televised on WIS-TV on Thanksgiving Eve which "panned USC and praised Clemson for the higher persistence rate Clemson has towards graduation as opposed to USC-Columbia," and upon a related newspaper article. The embarrassment occasioned by that report is alleviated somewhat by the announcement that USC, and not Clemson, had been selected as the site for a national conference on student retention and related subjects.

Professor Gardner complimented USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Lancaster on the activities of their "twigs" in Waltherboro and Camden respectively.

He expressed optimism about the responses of USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Union to the critical enrollment conditions.

Professor Gardner then received questions from the Senators.

Senator Robert Castleberry (Sumter): "John, if you could, I would like clarification on a matter that you really haven't addressed yet, and that relates to what happens once this body takes action, in whatever way--passed recommendations, concerns,

whatever. What happens to that recommendation? Does it have to go up for administrative approval? If so, what are the channels it follows? How long should it potentially take? And how would we know about it? Maybe as framework, last year we made several recommendations concerning salaries. What would be the procedure on that?"

Professor Gardner: "Let me speak to you in both general and specific terms to that, first of all, with respect to the general process. As I know you have heard John Duffy say, and so I will speak for him and literally use his words, (he used these words with the Executive Committee on November 8th or 9th, when we last met with that group.) The University Campuses Faculty Senate is a body that is an advisory body to the University Administration and your actions are subject to review through the normal channels that you report through. Which in this case would be to the Office of the Vice President and from there to the President and from there to the Board. For example, last year, when you made the revisions in our Manual, those revisions were of course acted upon in April of 1983 by this body and then they came to Columbia and representatives of your Executive Committee and myself and John Duffy worked on that project for four or five months. Then we finally submitted it to the President, who approved it, and then it went to the Board, and there was approved. The same thing happened this past spring with your salary recommendations. Again, they were obviously directed to us and we took them to the President and, in turn, he gave a decision, and of course that was part of the overall budget approach for the following fiscal year and that approach was approved by the Board. Another example was your name change. You gave us three or four options for different names for our campus organization and we took those to the President and he selected one and then that went to the Board. In general, that is how we've been proceeding. Let me be, perhaps at some risk, even more specific about another matter. At your last meeting an action was taken that, again, we view as advisory, and it was the action with respect to an alteration in the wording of the Faculty Manual. Normally, wording changes in the Faculty Manual go from this body, as when we last revised the Manual, to our Office, to the President, and then to the Board of Trustees. That would be the kind of procedure that we would follow in that kind of a case. Does that respond to your question?"

Senator Castleberry asked if the Senate's advice to the administration was supposed to be in the form of a special report, or if the administration simply gleaned what it needed from the Minutes.

Professor Gardner replied, "Obviously, it is capable of being retrieved from the Minutes. It's also communicated immediately to us because we are in attendance here."

Senator Castleberry asked if that sufficed.

Professor Gardner answered, "Well, it does. In addition, a mechanism that, of course, you are free to use, is to have your Executive Committee and/or the person of your Chair or Secretary, as however you deem appropriate, communicate to us anything in writing that you specifically want to call to our attention. That is a mechanism that is already being widely used by this body. I made reference a few minutes ago, Bob, to the kinds of communications we'd gotten last year from you, when you were on the Welfare Committee, and this year from your successor, Professor Labyak, where you, as the appropriate representative of this body, communicate to us a request for information or a request for action, and then we respond as we deem appropriate. I think that with respect to most matters, we are smart enough to figure out most of what you want, and then obviously we have got to decide how we want to respond."

Senator Don Curlovic (Sumter) asked for clarification on the Budget and Control Board's recommendation for salary increases for University employees. He noted that a recent newspaper report about the recommendations seemed to imply a slight discrepancy from the report given earlier by Professor Gardner.

The Associate Vice President replied that he could not say whether the newspaper report was accurate, but that his report had been based on a conversation yesterday with the University's Budget Director. Classified employees, it appears, will get their merit raises on the "review dates." As faculty and other unclassified employees have no "review dates," their raises will be awarded as of January 1, 1986.

Senator Curlovic asked if there were some way that the University could give the raise at the usual July 1 date by drawing upon other parts of the budget.

Professor Gardner answered, "That's a very important question because I think it has been made clear to many of you this year in order to provide the kind of raises we did for the University Campuses Faculty, which significantly exceeded the University System average percentages, we had to come up with additional sources of revenue. The way we did that was by eating the revenue out of the operational side of our budgets which meant we had to cut back on a number of other areas. The problem for next year is we've got in some cases, on some campuses, less money because of the formula problem; we've got increases in all our fixed costs, we've got shortages because of the amount of money we cut back this year; and at this point we cannot tell you, in all good faith, that we will have the ability to go into our operating funds next year, as we did this year, to come up with that kind of money. We do not want you to have false expectations and we do not want to mislead you. What I am intending to say to Mr. Labyak and his committee I think bears repeating here, we are going to do the best we can for you with all the money we've got and we're going to do our damndest to get all the money we can. Last

year, as you know, we were successful to the point where we aroused some envy, I guess I will call it, in some other sectors because of the way we handled this. It's just too early in the game. We don't know yet what we're going to be able to do for next year."

Dean May asked if the report on WIS-TV and the subsequent newspaper report comparing the retention rates of USC and Clemson had taken into account the fact that part-time adult students comprise a large percentage of USC's student population.

Professor Gardner replied, "Yes it did. That's one of the reasons why our persistence rates are lower. The two bases were totally misleading for this comparison. To compare an urban university at which two-thirds of its students are commuting, and twenty-five percent are nontraditional, part-time students to a rural university of which 90 plus percent are residential, traditional-aged...is a very fallacious kind of comparison. We supplied information to WIS-TV: they chose not to use it."

IV. Reports from Standing Committees

A. Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Professor Joan Taylor (Beaufort)

At present, the Rights and Responsibilities Committee reiterates to the University Campuses Faculty Senate that the manual change at the last meeting concerning membership was for clarification only and was not a substantive change. Currently, it needs no further action by this Committee nor does it need administrative approval since it was merely a clarifying change rather than a substantive one. For further clarification, librarians are understood to be full-time teaching faculty as cited on page 18 and other pages of the Faculty Manual. The Committee wishes to make no more comment on this matter currently, pending a meeting with this Committee and Dr. Duffy's Office and with faculty members and others who wish to address this Committee. All those who wish to make input should do so in writing to the Chair of this Committee by January 15th.

B. Welfare Committee - Professor Greg Labyak (Salkehatchie)

The chairman reported that an official response to questions of the Welfare Committee concerning faculty salary increases for the 1984-85 academic year has been requested of Professor Gardner, and said response is being prepared.

It was also reported that the study of faculty salaries is being pursued in the same manner as last year. Appropriate statistics have been requested of the Affirmative Action Office and Dr. Milton Baker.

Other pay-related issues were discussed, and the Committee is requesting information from the administration on the following:

- 1) the possibility of paying full-time faculty on a bi-weekly basis during summer sessions; and
- 2) possible flexibility in the manner that stipends for courses not covered under the base pay scale--i.e. overloads, continuing education, short courses, etc.--are figured in the salary structure and therefore in the way that they are taxed.

The chairman agreed to inquire about comparative data on retirement packages for South Carolina and other states.

Materials pertaining to faculty organization and workload, overload, and contact hours policies at the University Campuses were distributed.

C. Intra-University Services and Communications - Professor Robert Costello (Sumter)

The Committee devoted a majority of this meeting to a survey of student evaluations of faculty on each of the University Campuses. We found a rich diversity of evaluation forms which could be of value to any campus seeking a new format. It was noted that some forms were primarily objective and quantifiable, whereas others required significant subjective input from the students. Major issues that were raised in relation to student evaluations of faculty included the following:

- 1) Confidentiality, which could be compromised either by the instructor's presence during the evaluations or by the instructor's receiving unprocessed evaluations with the original handwriting on them.

- 2) The diverse uses to which evaluations are put, ranging from assistance in course improvement for the instructor to criteria for pay raises and promotion of the instructor.

- 3) The timing of evaluations: when are they given? Generally, it's toward the end of the course, and so instructors on some campuses give them with the final exam.

- 4) The importance of clarity on these evaluation forms, especially when numerical rating scales are used. There was a diversity of whether or not the student had to remember all the way down the line whether "one" was good and "five" was bad or vice versa, and there were some reports that there had been confusion on these areas.

We began talking about other evaluation categories, such as evaluation of administrators by faculty; and evaluation of part-time faculty by students, by full-time faculty, and by administrators.

Pursuant to other continuing interests, the Committee is seeking input on the following issues.

1) Academic articulation within the entire USC System (course transferability, academic regulations, etc.), particularly as it affects the University Campuses. Of course, this involves the Four-Year Campuses as well as the Columbia Campus.

2) Data for updating the Faculty Resource Manual. We received some data on that from the Sumter Campus. The Association of Afro-American Students had been left out of the last Faculty Resource Manual. If there are other similar cases around the System, we'd like to rectify that situation.

In addition, we would like to introduce the following resolution expressing our appreciation for the nine years of service to the USC System by Mary Ann Camp. The resolution reads:

During her tenure and Director of the Library Processing Center for the University and Four-Year Campuses, Mary Ann Camp has provided consistent leadership and has been responsible for moving the Processing Center from a fledgling agency to an organization which is in the forefront of library services in the USC System and the Library Community.

Mary Ann Camp has also been instrument through her leadership, her personal integrity, and her professional excellence, in the movement of professional librarian in the University Campuses from a position of nebulous status to respected members of the University faculty.

Mary Ann Camp will be missed by members of her own faculty from Lifelong Learning and by members of the faculties of all the University Campuses.

Therefore, the University Campuses Faculty Senate expresses its gratitude and appreciation to Mary Ann Camp and wishes her well in her future endeavors.

This is in the form of a motion from the committee.
(Carries unanimously.)

(Extracted from the tape of the meeting. Written report from the Committee was unavailable.)

V. Executive Committee - Professor Rod Sproatt (Beaufort)

The Executive Committee, Standing Committee Chairpersons, and Vice Presidents Duffy and Gardner met on the Columbia Campus on November 9th. It was brought to the attention of the Executive Committee that some campuses are not in compliance with the University Campuses Faculty Manual concerning voting membership in each campus faculty organization. Because there was a problem with the implementation of the Manual clarification approved by the Senate in September, everyone present discussed the situation. After a long debate, the matter was referred to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee for study.

Other matters discussed included local tenure and promotion procedures at the various campuses. Concerns were also expressed about non-tenured faculty members serving on the Committee of Twelve and the practice of Assistant Professor voting on promotion decisions involving associate and full professorships. This issue is presently in committee.

VI. Reports from Special Committees

A. University Library Committee - Professor Betty Martin (Union)

Professor Charles Walker (Union) reported for Professor Martin that the Library Committee had not met.

B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses - Professor Carolyn West (Sumter)

The Committee on Curricula and Courses has met twice since the last University Campus Senate meeting. Actions taken that are of concern to the University Campuses include:

1.a. History 375-Revolution in Contemporary History was deleted from the curriculum.

b. History 321 and 322-Europe from WWI - WWII and Europe from WWII to the present - updating and clarification of course content.

c. History 315 and 316 consolidated into a single course History 315 - The Iberian Peninsula.

2.a. Physics 211 and 212 - wording of course description changed to reflect what is actually being taught in the courses, which is 211 - Mechanics and Wave Motion, 212 - Electromagnetism including circuits.

b. Physics 213 - added to curriculum and covers modern physics including thermodynamics, optics and relativity.

3.a. Change in English major requirement - add courses English 461-465; 600-605; 609 to Linguistic/Writing options in connection with proposal to offer a concentration in writing.

b. Acceptance of major in English with concentration in writing which includes 12 hours of work in writing combined with 15 hours in literature/linguistics.

4. BIOL 232 - changed to 3 hours and added BIOL 232L as a separate course.

5. BIOL 242 - changed description by deleting "for nursing students only."

For information on other actions taken by the committee, refer to the Columbia Faculty Senate minutes for the months of October and November.

Professor West added that the University Committee on Curricula and Courses is well aware of the University System Campuses and the need for those campuses to be notified of curricula and course changes.

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

Professor Currence indicated he had had a communication problem with Columbia which was now resolved but he therefore had no report.

D. Academic Forward Planning Committee - Professor John Simpson (Beaufort)

Professor Gordon Haist (Beaufort) reporting for Professor Simpson.

The Academic Forward Planning Committee has selected as its major focus for this academic year 1984-85, the review of undergraduate education within the University of South Carolina System. With this particular concern, the Academic Forward Planning Committee has begun to look at a basic core curriculum for all baccalaureate students within our system. The majority of the Committee thinks this common academic experience for all students throughout the System will give strength to the undergraduate programs and "tie the System together" with an academic anchor of excellence for all of our students.

The majority of the members think that our focus on undergraduate education will produce a better graduate and bring the colleges on the Columbia Campus as well as throughout the System closer together in a common academic endeavor.

What has been proposed is a core that includes basic Math, Science, English, and History as they now exist in our curriculum and required of all baccalaureate students. The intention is to send out a message that the University is firmly committed to a Liberal Arts and Sciences experience

for all our students, with particular emphasis during their freshman year. It has been expressed in the Committee, particularly by the majority, that by simplifying our requirements and requiring all students to take the same freshman year, we will aid student recruitment, provide easier movement among the campuses within the System, and improve the academic quality of our graduates.

The Freshman Year

First Semester	Second Semester
English 101.....3 hrs.	English 102.....3 hrs.
History 101.....3 hrs.	History 102.....3 hrs.
Math.....3-4 hrs.	Math.....3-4 hrs.
Science (lab)....4 hrs.	Science.....3-4 hrs.
<u>13-14 hrs.</u>	<u>12-14 hrs.</u>

The curriculum will be completed before a student is allowed to officially enter a college of the University. In addition to this curriculum, we have the requirement of the foreign language for our students. This requirement should not prevent the student from entering a particular college, however, the requirement must be satisfied before the degree is awarded.

1. This should not present a problem for campuses within the University System.
2. This curriculum should not present a problem for Humanities Majors.
3. Science and Math Majors should have no problem with this curriculum.
4. Professional Schools could have their potential students take the introductory course to their area in addition to the above.

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

Professor Cordray reported that this Committee had not met.

F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee - Professor John Logue (Sumter)

The Subcommittee of Engineering, Physical and Life Sciences for Research and Productive Scholarship met on Tuesday, November 13, 1984 to consider proposals from 37 applicants. Ten applications were recommended for funding which totaled approximately \$15,000.

While not a part of the formal report, I believe that I would be remiss if I did not point out that the committee wishes to encourage research on the various campuses of the University System and seems to favor proposals from campuses represented by this Senate. Unfortunately, there were no proposals from our faculties to this Subcommittee.

G. System Committee - Professor Sally Johns (Lifelong Learning)

The System Committee met in Columbia on October 11. Topics discussed included participation in October of President Holderman and a number of USC women in a State Forum for Women Administrators in Higher Education; the Lightsey Commission; the Desegregation Plan; a study of the computer fee; and the outlook for the next legislative session.

The Committee will meet next on December 14.

VII. Unfinished Business

Associate Vice President Gardner asked to make the following comment:

"As the only member of our Office present today, I feel compelled to make a fairly simple response to something that frankly happened quite so rapidly that I didn't have time to make response at that point. We moved from the report of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee immediately to the report of the Welfare Committee, and I just don't want something to be inferred from my silence about this that would be contrary to the reality as we see it. I want you to know that, to date, our Office has interpreted the action that you took at the September meeting as a substantive matter and not just a clarifying matter and therefore is one that we have to review. Of course, we are very free to change our minds and decide that it is not a substantive matter and that it is indeed only a matter of clarification. We frankly don't know what we're going to do. Because of that, we look forward to and we welcome and are most appreciative of the opportunity that this committee has offered for some extended discussion of this very important subject with the committee. On behalf of both Johns, I wanted to thank the committee for giving us that opportunity."

Senator Rod Sproatt (Beaufort) asked, "...in proceedings such as this, is it not normal practice for the body to decide which matters are substantive in nature and which are clarification?"

The Chair replied, "This is a question that Professor Sproatt asked me during the break today and my answer at that time was I don't think I have ever before heard of anyone other than the body questioning whether or not something was a substantive issue. I think that question can probably be discussed at the same time the other questions are being

discussed as this committee meets with Professor Gardner and Professor Duffy. I hope you did understand that Professor Taylor said that any members of the Senate, any faculty members, and anyone else, by January 15, should get to her their input in writing."

VIII. New Business

None

IX. Announcements

The Secretary requested that all motions and reports, even negative reports, be turned in to him in writing. He also requested that he be provided with an attendance report of the various delegations.

Members of the Executive Committee were also asked to insure that copies of the September meeting minutes are distributed to their respective campus faculties.

Senator Sherre Dryden (Salkehatchie) announced that at the February 85 meeting the Salkehatchie Campus plans a demonstration of an on-line library catalog system and that anyone interested in hands-on experience with such a system should contact her prior to that meeting.

Dean Carl Clayton thanked the Senate, on behalf of the Salkehatchie Campus, for the opportunity to host the February meeting, and announced plans to hold that meeting at the Walterboro facility. Salkehatchie, he said, is eager to share what it is doing in Walterboro with the Senate.

X. Adjournment

APPENDIX: List of Senators Present
(Note: See attached list)

Attending November 30 Senate meeting

USC-Beaufort

Rick Boulware
Karen Guinn (alternate for Lila Meeks)
Gordon Haist
Rod Sproatt
Joan Taylor

USC-Lancaster

Wade Chittam
Jerry Currence
Jimmie Nunnery
John Samaras
Edna Shook

USC-Salkehatchie

Bill Bowers
Billy Cordray
Sherre Dryden
Greg Labyak

USC-Sumter

Robert Castleberry
Lee Craig
Robert Costello
Don Curlovic
John Logue
Sal Macias (subs. for Laura Zaidman)
Tom Powers
Papti Rajagopal

USC-Union

Bruce McDaniel
Harold Sears
Charles Walker
Tandy Willis

Lifelong Learning

Mary Ann Camp
Steve Dalton
Sally Johns
Elizabeth Mulligan

Workload, Overload Compensation, and Contact Hours
Policies for University Campuses, Fall 1984

	<u>Course Loads</u>	<u>Overload Compensation</u>	<u>Contact Hours</u>
Union	15/15*	\$900-\$1150 (depends on degree and faculty rank)	full credit for contact hours
Lancaster	12/12**	\$1,000 (3 credit hours)	12 credit hours= 15-18 contact hours
Sumter	12/12	\$1,100 (3 hour course)	full credit for contact hours
Beaufort	12/12	7½% of normal salary (3 credit hours)	no credit for contact hours
Salkehatchie	12/15	compensation based on enrollment with a 6% maximum***	partial (half) credit for contact hours

* Some faculty members are teaching twelve hours during the current semester

** On occasion, a course load of 12/15 may be required

*** Enrollment is determined by averaging all classes for the semester in which the overload occurs

The Union, Lancaster, Beaufort, and Salkehatchie Campuses have no written policy regarding course reductions for non-teaching responsibilities, although reduced course loads have been allowed in certain instances. At Sumter, division coordinators receive a 6 hour reduction, and a reduction of 3 hours is granted to student advisors.

9/84

Attached are minutes of the Senate Meeting of 28 September 1984. This is an edited version. The complete, unexpurgated transcript is available at the Office of the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education.

Thomas L. Powers
Secretary