

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

APRIL 19, 1985
USC-BEAUFORT
BEAUFORT, SC

INFORMAL SESSION

Chairperson Sally Johns (Lifelong Learning) called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Deans' Remarks:

Dean Ron Tuttle (Beaufort) welcomed the Senate to "the most beautiful campus in the USC System." He announced the schedule for the day's events and gave credit to Rod Sproatt and Mary Allen for having arranged it all. He announced that the new Marine Science Building was just getting started, that a bill providing \$2.2 million for the purchase of the old elementary school building had been introduced in the state legislature by S.C. State Senator James Waddell, and that Ed Caine had been awarded a \$9,500 grant from the Venture Fund.

Dean Pete Arnold (Lancaster) announced that there was no dramatic news from Lancaster. He did announce that John Samaras was leaving USC-Lancaster for a position at Valdosta State College.

Dean John May (Lifelong Learning) said that Lifelong Learning had had a good spring, and was getting geared up for Summer and Fall.

Dean Carl Clayton (Salkehatchie) reviewed progress at the Salkehatchie Campus during the past year, and pronounced himself pleased with the progress and optimistic about the future. The Summit Fund drive had been successful, an improved salary package had been implemented, the Walterboro "twig" was developing nicely, and USC-Salkehatchie had just recorded its largest Spring enrollment in its 20-year history. The new admission standards at USC-Columbia should have "a positive impact" upon future enrollments, and the report of the Lightsey Commission should bring good results for the University Campuses. USC-Salkehatchie would be celebrating its twentieth anniversary during the coming year, and a celebration was being planned for the Fall semester.

Dean Jack Anderson (Sumter) announced that Sumter had had a busy year. A new advisement program was in effect, the new Humanities and Health Sciences Building was taking shape, and many faculty members were presenting professional papers and participating in programs. The Summit Fund drive had gone very well. Plans were

afoot to add a second floor to the Administration Building. The campus administration was working to enhance the library. Dean Anderson pronounced himself optimistic about the future, saying that the campus anticipated increased enrollments next year.

Dean Kenneth Davis (Union) announced the beginning of Union Awareness Week, ten days of activities, which began on 18 April. This event should enhance the University's image in the community, and would be highlighted by an awards banquet and an Open House. He announced the awarding of several grants to Union, and pronounced himself optimistic for the future, saying that he expected Union to have its highest enrollments ever in the Fall.

Other

Chairperson Johns introduced Jim Morris (Director of Academic Services and Higher Education, Computer Services Division, USC-Columbia), who made the following announcements:

The Computer Services Division has the "Quintillian Analysis" program. This computer software is used in prose composition analysis. Campuses wishing to have the program should send two double-sided, double-density disks to CSD, which will return them with the program.

There is another composition program named "Writer's Workbench," which will run on the University's mainframe computer. This program assists in teaching students to write properly. It will be available in the Fall.

USC has become a member of ITNET, an international computer communications network. Now it will be possible for USC users to share files and other computer information with other users throughout the United States and Europe.

The new telephone communications system is in effect in Columbia. There are problems, but most are not in the equipment. The bugs are being worked out.

The Computer Services Division has grown and improved dramatically in the last five years.

Senator Johns introduced new senators, who will begin serving their terms next year.

Vice Chair Rod Sproatt (Beaufort) presented the report of the Nominating Committee. The following were nominated for office for the coming year:

Vice Chair, Executive Committee	Tom Powers (Sumter)
Secretary, Executive Committee	Tandy Willis (Union)
Member-at-large, Executive Committee	Sherre Dryden (Salkehatchie)
Member-at-large, Executive Committee	Wade Chittam (Lancaster)
Representative to the Research and Productive Scholarship Committee	Allan Charles (Union)
Representative to the Curricula and Courses Committee	Wayne Thurman (Lancaster)
Representative to the Academic Planning Committee	Bob Group (Salkehatchie)
Representative to the University Library Committee	Elizabeth Mulligan (Lifelong Learning)
Representative to the Board of Trustees/Faculty Liaison Committee	Doug Darran (Sumter)

In accordance with the By-Laws, Vice Chair Rod Sproatt will become Chair, and Chair Sally Johns will become Immediate Past Chair. In accordance with past practice, the Chair will represent the Senate on the System Committee.

Carolyn West was nominated from the floor for Representative to the Curricula and Courses Committees.

At this point, the Senate adjourned, and members reported to the meetings of their respective Standing Committees.

GENERAL SESSION

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Johns called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Senator Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster) introduced Darlene McManus, who was attending as alternate for Wayne Thurman.

II. Correction/Approval of Minutes: 15 February 1985 USC-Salkehatchie Walterboro Campus Walterboro, SC

Minutes of the 15 February meeting were distributed. Correction and approval was postponed until the September meeting.

III. Reports from University Officers

A. Dr. John Duffy (System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education) announced that Mary Barton of Union had been selected University Campuses Teacher of the Year.

Dr. Duffy reported that the budget was still in the legislative process. He congratulated the University Librarians for their work with the On-Line Catalog Project. His Office has recommended that the University be funded for \$250,000 for the On-Line Catalog project, "but don't hold your breath on that."

As a result of John Gardner's efforts, some of our campuses have had their desegregation funds restored. All got such funding last year, all were cut this year, but three of five have had such funding restored.

The Office of the System Vice President is working to have more education courses taught on the University Campuses, especially Education 201, 202, and 203. The Office is also working with the College of Education to create a Rural Education Project at USC-Salkehatchie. This project will offer scholarship money to students willing to commit themselves to teaching a minimum period of time in a rural environment after graduation. If this works out, it should "have applicability throughout the entire University System."

Next year, the Desegregation Plan allows scholarships of \$1,000 annually to minority students who have the associate's degree and a 2.5 GPR and who will be attending USC-Columbia, USC-Spartanburg, or the College of Charleston. Eligible minority students on all University Campuses should be notified. More information is available from David Hunter.

Dr. Duffy expressed concern at the proposed revision of Section 127 of the United States Internal Revenue Code. If changes proposed by the present administration go into effect, the impact upon financial aid would result in USC-Columbia losing approximately 1,000 students. Nationally, an estimated 1,000,000 students would be lost. Faculty should contact their legislators and insist upon maintaining the status-quo, under which students receiving financial support from their employers to attend college do not pay taxes on their stipends. About 50% of the student body at Beaufort is in the military and is receiving such assistance. If the changes go through, they will have to pay income taxes AND social security taxes on that tuition assistance, and that will discourage many from taking advantage of the program. This poses a severe threat to enrollments.

Dr. Duffy closed by announcing that Deborah Cureton (Lancaster) had won a Carnegie-Mellon Fellowship for the summer.

B. Professor John Gardner (Associate Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education) began with a report that the Columbia Campus's Select Committee on Library Provisioning for Graduate Excellence was assessing the System library capabilities to support graduate instruction. That Committee's report will praise the non-Columbia campuses' work in this regard.

He continued by commending Sherre Dryden for her recent letter to the Chronicle of Higher Education on the importance of the concept of faculty librarianship and the participation of librarians in faculty governance.

The Commission on Undergraduate Education met this morning with three consultants, including the Education Editor of the New York Times. The Commission has met on all campuses so far. Another meeting will be held on April 30 to see if there might be any information from any campus yet to be gleaned. In May, there will be a meeting to begin developing the draft of the report. The goal is to have a completed report by October. Anyone having thoughts to express to the Commission should contact the System representatives on the Commission. Interestingly, the Four-Year Campuses have expressed concerns very similar to those of the University Campuses.

The Office of the System Vice President is administering a Quality of Life Assessment Survey to students on all five University Campuses. Data derived from this should be useful to all campuses.

The Academic Planning Committee of the Columbia Campus is seriously interested in hearing the views of the Senate about the Freshman Year proposal.

In May, there will be a special University 101 workshop for those who already have had the basic workshop. The workshop will focus on developing skills useful to all teachers in all disciplines. The Office of the System Vice President will assist with travel funds for those wishing to participate.

The new admission standards at the Columbia Campus should result in increased enrollments at the University Campuses. The Admissions Office will make available to each of the campuses a list of the students who did not "make the cut," and who are potential candidates for enrollment.

The Byrnes Center for International Studies is being reorganized. The President would like to have faculty from non-Columbia campuses involved in international studies activities outside the United States.

The University Campuses are trying to raise their profiles in Times 9. Please let that publication know if there are any newsworthy activities.

Professor Gardner concluded by discussing the process by which Columbia Campus faculty approve credentials for those teaching 300- and 400-level courses on University Campuses. Some Columbia departments feel that the University Campuses have gone too far in this regard and want more control over who teaches these courses. The Office of the System Vice President is working carefully on this delicate matter, and asks that faculty on the University Campuses be patient while cautious negotiations continue.

IV. Reports from Standing Committees

A. Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Senator Joan Taylor (Beaufort) reported that the Committee had elected Jimmie Nunnery to be chair next year. The Committee surveyed advisement procedures at each campus, and presented its results (see Attachment A).

The Committee has also studied promotion and tenure procedures at the campuses, and is about 2/3 of the way through this process. During the investigation, the committee discovered a matter which, in its judgment, needs attention now. To that end, the Committee presented the following motion:

Representatives to the University Campuses Promotion and Tenure Committee shall not serve on local Promotion and Tenure Committees for that year.

This motion was presented for inclusion in the minutes. As a substantive issue, it could not now be decided, but was put forth for final action at the September meeting.

John Samaras (Lancaster) expressed the committee's appreciation for Joan Taylor's service for the year.

Discussion now returned to the motion.

Senator Joan Taylor defended the motion by noting that there was a danger in having one person's input at too many places in the promotion and tenure process. Senator Gordon Haist (Beaufort) asked about the impact of this proposal on Lifelong Learning, which had so few faculty. Chairperson Johns responded that this would pose no problem. Senator Lila Meeks wanted to know what was wrong with the present system. Senator Taylor responded that double input was not a good idea.

Associate Vice President Gardner offered historical content to the issue. In the mid-70s when the System instituted this procedure, it was intended that no one have double input. As it happened at the time, there were not enough senior and tenured people in the System to permit this. The Committee of 12 was intended to provide a second look at the files of candidates, and to insure that all rights of candidates were protected through proper procedures at the local levels.

Senator Haist suggested that there might be a problem in the fact that the members of the Committee of 12 sit in judgement of people they do not know. The result of this is that members of the committee listen especially carefully to the statements of the two representatives of the campuses of the respective candidates. In this case, it would seem beneficial for those spokesmen to have been involved on the local level so that they might better present their candidates. The proposed change would threaten that advantage. Senator Taylor responded that the R & R Committee felt that the P & T Committee paid more attention to files than to personal recommendations. Senator Haist noted that the spokesmen were the major source of information on WHY a file was the way it was.

Senator Tandy Willis noted that this would restrain both Dr. Duffy's appointments and faculty elections to the Committee of 12. He asked if it were possible that there might be, on some campus, a case where there were insufficient senior tenured faculty not then going through the process themselves to permit the proposed procedure to work. Senator Taylor noted that Lifelong Learning MIGHT be put in a difficult position from time to time, but that the committee foresaw no problems elsewhere. Senator Willis asked if the elected representative not privy to discussions on the lower lever, might lack information necessary to explain the candidacy of someone from his or her campus in an adequate manner.

Senator Bob Group (Salkehatchie) noted that the motion did not prohibit an elected or appointed member of the Committee of 12 from being privy to the discussions of the local committee, only from being a voting member of it. The intent was not to create a blind representative, but to prohibit any one person from making a decision on any one case more than one time.

Senator Taylor said that she had interpreted the motion differently. In her view, members of the Committee of 12 should have no input in the local process, and deliberation was input. Senator Group noted the discrepancy of interpretation, and stuck to his own view.

Senator Ed Caine expressed concern for the danger of having someone a candidate has irritated sitting in judgment on that candidate twice. Senator Haist agreed, and suggested the necessity for rethinking the entire promotion and tenure process. He expressed reservations that the Committee of 12 had greater power than the local committee, which knew the candidate better. Senator Group commented that the two representatives on the Committee of 12 were presenting the case of the candidate from their campus, and that for them to express ignorance of a candidate's case was equivalent to casting a negative vote for that candidate.

Senator Samaras noted the analogy to the judicial process. A trial judge may not sit on an appeals court which reviews a case he has decided. A similar situation applies here. He

added that the members of the Committee of 12 need not be representatives of the local committee. The Committee of 12 was a reviewing committee, which made decisions on the basis of recommendations of local committees.

At this point, the Senate reviewed tenure and promotion committee structures at each campus. Sumter was the only campus which required that the Committee of 12 members not be members of the local committee. Senator Willis suggested that local faculty decision should prevail here, and that the Senate should not bind the hands of the local faculties, especially since the majority of campuses now have a system where double input is the rule.

Senator Taylor stated that these procedures often had evolved, rather than having been established by conscious action. Now that there were enough people to make the system work as originally intended, it was time to establish it so. The old way wasn't necessary any more.

Senator Willis asked why this was even an appropriate matter for the Senate to consider, rather than being a local prerogative. Senator Taylor responded that all faculty from all campuses went through the Committee of 12 and are there subject to the same process. Senator Caine added that there might be possible legal complications should anyone challenge an adverse decision on grounds of double jeopardy.

Senator Meeks suggested that senators take the proposal back to their faculties and discuss it, then vote upon the motion at the Fall meeting. This way, there could be adequate local input on the decision.

Chairperson Johns reminded the Senate that it was possible to take a final vote on a substantive motion at the same meeting at which it was introduced, provided the Senate agreed by a 2/3 vote to do so.

Senator Bob Costello (Sumter) moved that the Senate do so. THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED.

Senator Haist noted that, as the matter was to be deferred until Fall, the Committee look into other aspects of the process. He wondered why the Committee of 12 had two representatives--one elected and one appointed from each campus. He suggested that, since this was a faculty committee, both members should be elected by the faculty. Chairperson Johns responded that, since the Rights and Responsibilities Committee would be continuing discussions in the meantime, all persons having suggestions on the matter should bring them to the committee.

Senator Group noted that this proposal did not eliminate all problems associated with double input, as division coordinators might still be elected or appointed to one or more of the committees. He suggested that the Senate consider this matter before the next meeting.

Discussion now passed to the next topic.

B. Welfare Committee - Senator Greg Labyak (Salkehatchie) reported that the Welfare Committee met in Beaufort on Thursday, April 18 and again on Friday, April 19. The primary concern of the Committee was the study of faculty salaries. A 1985 salary report, based on an examination of salary statistics for the University Campuses and other units of the USC System, other institutions of higher education, and public schools, as well as information regarding the implementation of 1984-85 salary increases on the University Campuses, was presented by the Salary Subcommittee. The report was discussed and salary recommendations were approved for distribution to the full Senate. In addition, the Committee decided to request an administrative response to the following questions concerning pay increases for the 1985-86 academic year:

1. Were pay increases allocated as follows:

- a) Did you allocate the state-mandated raise for each faculty member receiving at least a "satisfactory" evaluation?
- b) Did you then allocate additional merit pay as appropriate?
- c) Did you make bottom-end adjustments where appropriate?
- d) Were promotional increase awarded independently of a-c above?

2. How did you define and distribute merit increase? Please provide our Committee with the following information on merit increases: mean increases, median increase, frequency distribution based on your particular system (e.g., percentage, step increments, dollar amounts, etc.). It is requested that these statistics be obtained separately for nine-month faculty and twelve-month faculty.

It is requested that the 1985 salary recommendations (passed by the University Campuses Faculty Senate on April 19) be included in the minutes of this meeting.

The Welfare Committee is also requesting information from the administration regarding plans for undesignated Summit Funds.

Additional data concerning retirement pay in South Carolina and other states were distributed to members of the Committee.

Senator Labyak distributed a copy of a list of recommendations from the committee, and moved that they be adopted by the Senate. (See Attachment B.) Senator Robert Castleberry noted that, where the report and recommendations mentioned "12-month faculty", they referred to all faculty not under nine-month contracts.

The Senate proceeded to discussion on each of the recommendations in sequence. In regard to recommendation #1 (see Attachment B), Senator Mulligan asked if it were feasible for the administration to provide the requested data in the requested format and time frame. Senator Labyak said the Committee believed the data would be available as requested, but was not certain, and asked the Office of the System Vice President to address that. Associate Vice President Gardner said, "We'll certainly do our best to get you the data by when you ask for it." He said that, if the Office consulted the University's system-wide data base, there might be difficulties in getting information in a timely manner, but there would be no problem if a data base from the University Campuses were used. He noted that there might be a problem getting figures on 9-month vs 12-month employees, for some campuses might have very few 12-month employees, and there the restrictions of the Privacy Act might prohibit release of information. Under provisions of that regulation, information on groups of fewer than three employees may not be released. Professor Gardner further commented that unclassified state employees do not get a Cost of Living increase, and do not share in the legislatively-mandated state employees' raise each year. All faculty increases are merit increases, and faculty members have no automatic right to receive the same Cost of Living increase received by classified state employees. Senator Labyak responded that the committee was aware of this, but was recommending that "satisfactory performance be deemed to be worthy of a reward that is comparable to the state-mandated increase."

Chairperson Johns noted that the matter now under discussion was not part of recommendation #1, and asked that further discussion be confined to that subject. There being no further discussion, the Senate voted on recommendation #1. THE RECOMMENDATION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Discussion passed to Recommendation #2. (See Attachment B.) There was no discussion. THE RECOMMENDATION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Discussion passed to Recommendation #3. (See Attachment B.) There was no discussion. THE RECOMMENDATION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Discussion turned to Recommendation #4. (See Attachment B.) System Vice President Duffy noted that this recommendation had system-wide implications. He suggested that the Senate consult with the USC-Columbia Faculty Senate's Welfare Committee and consider taking parallel action with it. He said that his Office would raise the issue with the President, but that the first thing he would want to know was what the other campuses were doing, and that it would help immensely if all campuses were pulling together. He also suggested that contact be made with the Four-Year Campuses. There being no further discussion, the Senate voted on Recommendation #4. THE RECOMMENDATION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Discussion turned to Recommendation #5. (See Attachment B.) There was no discussion. The Senate voted on Recommendation #5. THE RECOMMENDATION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Discussion passed to Recommendation #6. (See Attachment B.) Dr. Duffy stressed that salary supplements are not now considered part of a raise package, but are considered separately. After questioning by Vice Chair Sproatt, Dr. Duffy said that he did not consider promotional increments part of a salary supplement. If someone were paid an additional stipend for performing administrative duties, that stipend would not be included as part of the raise package but would be treated separately. Professor Gardner added that salary supplements were NOT funded through the formula. Funding came in only for amounts designated as state-allocated merit raises. Additional money had to come from elsewhere. "Your deans have to find that money somewhere." Dr. Duffy suggested that he might be answering an unasked question. He explained that administrative salaries were not included in raise packages.

Senator Curlovic suggested that item 1 was misleading, that it was intended to refer not to salary supplements in general but to low-end adjustments in particular. Senator Labyak concurred. Senator Nunnery moved to amend the recommendation, striking the term "salary supplements" and substituting the phrase "low-end salary adjustments," so that item 1 of Recommendation #6 would read "Any low-end salary adjustments should be kept separate from the salary raises set by the State Legislature." Senator Labyak accepted the change as a friendly amendment.

There being no further discussion, the Senate voted on Recommendation #6. THE RECOMMENDATION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Dr. Duffy asked to comment on the whole question of salaries.

Last year, with the permission of the President, we did something which was very unusual. We went to the Budget and Control Board and secured permission to utilize our operating capital for non-appropriated salaries. I don't know that we've ever done that before. What that meant was that, in effect, we dipped into appropriated monies to pay the salaries. It will work to our advantage this year, in that the appropriation will reflect the lift in salaries.

Senator Dryden asked if the salaries on the tables attached to the committee's recommendations for 84/85 included 9-month salaries only. Senator Labyak responded that the tables included individuals who taught at least six hours during the academic year. Administrative people who qualified under that provision WERE included, although their salaries were figured on a 9-month basis. Senator Dryden asked if librarians were included. Senator Labyak responded that this had not been clarified. Further, some people were left out of the computations because the level of their salaries would skew the data.

Professor Gardner commented that even the graduate faculty at USC-Columbia was now having problems getting entry-level Ph.D. faculty, because comparable salaries for comparable qualifications in the public schools under the Educational Improvement Act were higher than the University was paying, so the question of comparable salaries with school teachers was affecting the entire University structure and not just the University Campuses.

Senator Meeks expressed the appreciation of the Senate to Senator Labyak for his exceptional work as Chair of the Welfare Committee. She also expressed appreciation for the hard work of the Salary Subcommittee, consisting of Senators Labyak, Castleberry, and Curlovic.

D. Intra-University Services and Communications - Senator Robert Costello (Sumter) reported that the committee had considered the following items of business: 1) evaluations, 2) proposals for faculty development, 3) curriculum proposals from USC-Lancaster and USC-Beaufort, 4) the proposed Freshman Year Curriculum advocated by the Academic Planning Committee of the USC Faculty Senate, and 5) election of a new chair.

Senator Linda Holderfield (Lifelong Learning) was elected Chair for the coming academic year.

The Committee presented three motions. The first was to approve the proposed requirements for a USC-Beaufort Associate Degree (see Attachment C.) There was no discussion. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The second motion was to approve USC-Lancaster's suggested curricula for Associate Degrees in Commercial and Secretarial Science (see Attachment D) with the exception that the term "College of Applied Professional Sciences" be deleted from the proposal. Senator Costello noted that it was not the intent of the motion to establish a College of Applied Professional Sciences at Lancaster, as the inclusion of that term in the printed proposal seemed to imply. There was no discussion. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The third motion was presented by Senator Haist.

The Intra-University Services and Communications Committee moves that the following sentiment be conveyed to the USC Academic Planning Committee concerning their Freshman Year Proposal:

The University Campuses Faculty Senate, having been requested by John Gardner to examine the Freshman Year proposal, finds this proposal worthy of consideration by the Senate on two grounds: 1) it effectively and uniformly deals with the problem of academic deficiencies in Freshman classes, which is a chronic problem on University Campuses; and 2) it

restores a sense of unity and pattern to the University's curriculum, which has been muted by changes in requirements from college to college and from campus to campus. However, before the Senate can agree to support this proposal, it must request that the Academic Planning Committee provide satisfactory answers to the following questions:

- 1) What structure would this proposal entail for the sophomore year and, more generally, how would it work to preserve the distinction between lower division and upper division studies?
- 2) What status would foreign language requirements have under the new proposal?
- 3) How would part-time degree-seeking, non-degree-seeking, and developmental students be brought under the strictures of this proposal, particularly concerning the twelve-month limitation?
- 4) What plan of reorganization of the University's curriculum can the Committee propose which would a) reduce competition among service courses without undermining either the diversity of the curriculum or the viability of academic requirements, and b) preserve the goals of unity and integration on successively higher and more specialized levels of the academic curriculum?

The University Campuses Faculty Senate commends the Committee's efforts to formulate a proposal on academic grounds that responds to problems that are academic in nature. We, therefore, encourage the Committee to continue its discussion of the proposal throughout the upcoming academic year. We furthermore would welcome the opportunity to engage in expanded dialogue for the sake of arriving at a mutually satisfactory and workable solution.

There was no discussion. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Senator Costello was commended for his services during the year.

- V. Executive Committee - Senator Rod Sproatt (Beaufort) delivered a report on the Committee's 05 APRIL meeting and on the meeting held this day.

The Executive Committee met with the Chairs of the Standing Committees on Friday, April 5, 1985, on the campus of the University of South Carolina at Columbia.

Senator Sproatt announced that the Senate would meet on April 19 at USC-Beaufort. He noted that both lunch and the reception would be at the John Cross Tavern. He conveyed Dean Tuttle's reminder that the campuses not hosting a Senate meeting this year chip in to help defray the exceptional expenses of the Beaufort meeting.

The Chairs of the Standing Committees reported on their committees' activities.

Professor Gardner reported on the progress of the proposal to institute a common Freshman Year curriculum in the University System. He judged that the proposal still had a long way to go before a final decision could be made on it, and suggested that it would, in all probability, not be adopted.

The Committee set the agenda for the Beaufort Meeting.

The Committee discussed the problem posed by occasional conflicts between service to the System and service to the local campuses. The general opinion was that administrators often fail to give appropriate credit for service to the system. No decision was made on the issue, and no specific plans for further investigation were made.

Senator Nunnery asked that the Senate compare the practices on the various campuses in selecting candidates for the Teacher of the Year award. Discussion revealed great variances in the process. The IUSC Committee was directed to study the matter and make an appropriate recommendation.

The Committee discussed several other matters of potential interest, but reached no conclusions and took no further action at this time.

The Executive Committee of the University Campuses Faculty Senate also met on 19 April 1985 on the campus of the University of South Carolina at Beaufort. Present were Chairperson Sally Johns, Vice Chairperson Rod Sproatt, Secretary Tom Powers, Immediate Past Chairperson Jimmie Nunnery, and Members-at-large Sherre Dryden and Tandy Willis.

The Committee discussed evaluation techniques at the various campuses, placing special emphases on faculty evaluation of administrators, but took no action.

The Committee also discussed the problems faced by some faculty members in trying to balance responsibilities to their local campuses and responsibilities to the University System. The committee concluded that different campuses handled this matter

differently, but that local administrators often seemed to think that local responsibilities were always worthy of priority, and that service to the System should take a back seat to service to the local campus. The Committee agreed that this was an unfortunate and, in the long run, self-defeating perspective. In an effort to encourage administrators at all levels to take seriously service to the System and to place on it an adequate priority, the Committee composed the following motion to be presented at the general session of the Senate later the same day. The motion was presented for action by the Senate.

WHEREAS, The University of South Carolina System offers many advantages to the faculty of the University Campuses; and,

WHEREAS, Being part of the System allows faculty members at each campus to exchange academic information and to consult with each other on matters of concern to faculty; and,

WHEREAS, The mutual support and shared resources which the campuses in the system offer each other enable each to maintain high standards and all to progress together; and,

WHEREAS, Associate Vice President John Gardner's letter of January 15, 1985 to the Chair of the Welfare Committee of the University Campuses Faculty Senate reiterates the great importance which the University Administration places upon faculty contributions to the System;

THEREFORE, The University Campuses Faculty Senate, realizing that support for the System constitutes support for each individual campus as well, calls upon administrators at all levels in the System to recognize the importance of faculty contributions to University System activities, and to allocate resources, priorities, and rewards accordingly.

In response to requests for clarification, Vice Chair Sproatt said that the motion reflected the belief that faculty activities on the System level often were not rewarded by administrators, indicating that some who award such things as pay increases, recommendations for promotion, etc., did not appreciate the relative importance of System level work. In some cases, it appeared that contributions to the System were considered a detraction from more highly regarded local priorities. The motion was intended to encourage administrators to recognize the importance of faculty participation in service to the University at the System level.

There was no further discussion. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Senator Meeks asked for a status report on the question of membership in local faculty organizations. Chairperson Johns replied that the matter was still "up in the air" and that there was no report available at this time.

VI. Reports from Special Committees

A. University Library Committee - Senator Charles Walker (Union) reported for the Senate's representative on the committee, Professor Betty Martin, that the Library Committee had not met since the last Senate meeting.

B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses - Senator John Logue (Sumter) reported for the Senate's representative to the committee, Professor Carolyn West. The Committee on Curricula and Courses has met five times since the last University Campuses Faculty Senate meeting. Action taken that is of interest to the University Campuses included the change of course number of BADM 190 to BADM 290. For information on other actions taken by this Committee, refer to the Columbia Faculty Senate minutes for the months of February and March. Chairperson Johns noted that Professor West was absent because she was representing the Senate at a meeting of the Commission on Undergraduate Education.

C. University Faculty Welfare Committee - Professor Jerry Currence (Lancaster) reported that the committee had not met since the last Senate Meeting.

D. Academic Planning Committee - Senator Haist presented the report of Professor John Simpson (Beaufort), the Senate's representative on the committee.

The Academic Planning Committee during its meetings on February 15 and March 22, 1985, had invited several administrators from the following Professional Colleges and Continuing Education and University Campuses:

February 15, 1985 - Professor Henry Price, Associate Dean, College of Journalism and Professor Elmer G. Schwartz, Associate Dean, College of Engineering.

March 22, 1985 - Professor John Gardner, Associate Vice President for Continuing Education and University Campuses; Professor Ed Mercer, Assistant Dean, College of Science and Mathematics; and Professor James Hilton, Associate Dean, College of Business Administration.

The responses from the above administrators to the Freshman Year Proposal were varied from favorable to unfavorable. Professor Henry Price, Associate Dean, College of Journalism viewed the Freshman Year Proposal favorably in that it addresses some of the problems encountered by journalism stu-

dents, such as not being able to compute percentages. Professor Elmer G. Schwartz, Associate Dean, College of Engineering indicated that he personally supported the Freshman Year Proposal with a few changes and clarifications, but he also indicated that the majority of the Engineering faculty opposed the Freshman Year Proposal primarily because they see it as an intrusion into the affairs of the College of Engineering.

The Academic Planning Committee at its March 22 meeting, received by far the most unfavorable responses to the Freshman Year Proposal to date. Professor James Hilton, Associate Dean, College of Business Administration responded favorably to the Freshman Year Proposal. However, Professor Ed Mercer, Assistant Dean, College of Science and Mathematics, and Professor John Gardner, Associate Vice President for Continuing Education and University Campuses raised several issues and concerns about the Freshman Year Proposal. Professor Ed Mercer indicated that because the Proposal is to be System-wide, it will create some problems between the three Four-Year Campuses and the College of Science and Mathematics, because several comparable math courses at the Four-Year Campuses have differences in course numbers, credit hours and descriptions. Additionally, since Four-Year Campuses are autonomous, Professor Mercer indicated that these Four-Year Campuses will also see the Freshman Year Proposal as an intrusion upon their autonomy by Columbia.

Professor John Gardner, Associate Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education, in his response to the Freshman Year Proposal, indicated that he had surveyed the Deans and Academic Deans of the University Campuses and reported several concerns about the proposal and its perceived impact on these campuses. Perceptions from the University Campuses were that the Freshman Year Proposal would have several negative effects, because the five University Campuses do not serve a traditional student population. The proposal was viewed as being too restrictive for part-time students and in addition may propose severe financial difficulties for these campuses. The Freshman Year Proposal, according to Professor Gardner, may also potentially limit University Campuses faculty to teaching lower level division courses.

An invitation was extended to the Academic Planning Committee on February 15 to meet with members of the University Campuses Faculty Senate at its April 19th meeting at the Beaufort Campus for discussion of the Freshman Year Proposal. However, the invitation was not accepted.

E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee - Professor Billy Cordray (Salkehatchie), representative to the committee, reported that the committee had not met since the last Senate meeting.

F. University Research and Productive Scholarship Committee - Senator John Logue (Sumter), the Senate's representative to the committee submitted his report.

The University of South Carolina Committee on Research and Productive Scholarship met on April 12, 1985, with Dr. Stanley Fowler of the School of Medicine as acting chair. The Committee reviewed twelve research proposals in the areas of Engineering, Physical and Life Sciences. Six Proposals were recommended for funding (\$15,000) and a seventh was referred to the subcommittee serving the humanities area for possible consideration.

G. System Committee - Chairperson Johns submitted her report.

The System Committee met March 7; Senator Johns did not attend this meeting.

At its meeting April 4, 1985 the following items were discussed:

1. The proposed legislative appropriation for a study to be conducted by the Commission on Higher Education concerning higher education in South Carolina.
2. Other budget concerns.
3. The Cuernavaca Project.
4. The availability of grants for the South Carolina Arts Commission community tours.
5. A progress report on the work on the President's Commission on Undergraduate Education

VII. Old Business

The Senate elected its officers for the coming year. In the only contested election, Carolyn West (Sumter) was chosen to represent the Senate on the Curricula and Courses Committee.

List of Officers for Academic Year 1985-1986

Chair, Rod Sproatt, USC-Beaufort; Vice-Chair, Tom Powers, USC-Sumter; Secretary, Tandy Willis, USC-Union; Immediate Past Chair, Sally Boyd Johns, USC-Columbia Lifelong Learning; Member-at-Large, Sherre Dryden, USC-Salkehatchie; Member-at-Large, Wade Chittam, USC-Lancaster; Representative to the Research and Productive Scholarship Committee, Allan Charles, USC-Union; Representative to the Curricula and Courses Committee, Carolyn West, USC-Sumter; Representative to the Faculty Welfare Committee, Jerry Currence, USC-Lancaster; Representative to the Academic Planning Committee, Bob Group, USC-Salkehatchie; Representative to the University Library Committee, Elizabeth Mulligan, USC-Columbia Lifelong Learning; Representative to the Board of Trustees/Faculty Liaison Committee, Doug Darran, USC-Sumter

VIII. New Business

None.

IX. Announcements

Vice Chair Sproatt announced that the son of Professor John Dean had died, and that a memorial service would be held at 3:00 p.m. Sunday.

Outgoing Chair Sally Johns was presented with a plaque commemorating her service to the Senate.

X. Adjournment

Chairperson Johns transferred the gavel, and the position of Chair, to new Chairperson Rod Sproatt. Chairperson Sproatt, upon receipt of the appropriate motion and by vote of the Senate, declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Powers, Secretary

Attachments:

- A. Summary of University Campuses Advisement Procedures.
- B. Welfare Committee Salary Recommendations, 1985.
- C. Proposed Requirements for USC-Beaufort Associate Degree.
- D. Proposed Requirements for USC-Lancaster Associate Degrees in Commercial Science and Secretarial Science.
- E. List of Senators Present.
- F. List of Senate Members for Academic Year 1985-1986.

SUMMARY OF UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES ADVISEMENT PROCEDURES

SELECTION AND NUMBER OF ADVISORS

Beaufort: Voluntary on grounds that people who want to do it will do a good job; about 3 of 15 do not
 Lancaster: "voluntary but expected"; all do.
 Lifelong Learning: Director of Fort Jackson program is official advisor assisted by Division's chief academic advisor and Director's assistant.
 Salkehatchie: All full-time faculty are advisors coordinated through Dean for Academic Services
 Sumter: 20 advisors appointed by Academic Dean
 Union: same as Salkahatchie: everybody advises, under Academic Dean

LOAD PER ADVISOR

Beaufort: around 20
 Lancaster: depends on advisor's area; Business people 40 to 50.
 Math 4 Or 5
 Lifelong Learning: Fort Jackson students are advised through Army education counselors but they are funneled through Fort Jackson office of Director of Fort Jackson. Mature students have own advisor.
 Salkehatchie: average of 25.
 Sumter: faculty advisors 60 to 70 and division chairs 30 to 40.
 Union: varies; students allotted according to mentor system rather than by discipline; they end up with someone with whom they have good relationship.

COMPENSATION

Sumter: advisors receive about 3 hours pay per academic year.
 Other Campuses: none

PREPARATION OF ADVISORS

Beaufort: advisor notebook, annual informal workshops, conferences with Academic Dean
 Lancaster: presentation by administrative advisor at faculty retreats, advisor notebook and checklist forms, updates from Academic Dean and Admissions Director
 Lifelong Learning: none; since done by trained administrative advisors
 Salkehatchie: this year the first year of program as it is; one formal and one informal workshop, one dealing with emotional/mentor aspects of advising, the other with technical aspects
 Sumter: Training workshops and two meetings a semester
 Union: Academic Dean passes out packet of procedures; advisors confer individually with Academic Dean

EXTENT OF STUDENT DATA IN POSSESSION OF ADVISOR

Beaufort: advisors get copy of student's file, usually with his/her transcript, courses taken and grades
 Lancaster: advisors do not have entire file for student; they sometimes have SAT scores and can request transcripts with math and English placement test scores

Lifelong Learning: have access to student files
Salkehatchie: advisors have folder with transcripts and SAT scores
and English placement test scores but no math placement scores
Sumter: advisors get student file. Admissions counseling and testing
is prerequisite for registration and test results, SAT scores,
his/her transcripts and courses taken are forwarded to advisor
Union: Advisors do not have student file but do have SAT scores and
Nelson Denny Reading scores for incoming freshmen

MEASUREMENT OF RESULTS

Beaufort: no formal method
Lancaster: retention studies, but advisement not a measured variable
Lifelong Learning: no formal method
Salkehatchie: attempt to design follow up study through survey showing
positive student reaction; survey helps to distinguish between
effects of advisement and other general factors
Sumter: retention studies; no formal study of advisement procedures.
Use exit interviews, student follow-up and review of evaluation
process to evaluate procedures.
Union: no formal method

DEGREE TO WHICH PROCESS IS CENTRAL CONTROLLED

Advisement procedures at all campuses coordinated by Academic Dean or
Dean of Student or Admissions; at Lancaster the Admissions office
preprints advisement forms, a specific form for each student and advisor
to which he's assigned; this keeps student-advisor record straight.

PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

At campuses where advising is not carried out by discipline or major,
we may have advisors advising in areas they're not sufficiently familiar
with

Methods for outreach to students who don't contact advisor need to be
improved

Problem of advisor selection: voluntary, mandatory? If mandatory and
heavy load, or if either mandatory or voluntary but not universal,
should there be some form of compensation?

WELFARE COMMITTEE SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS 1985

1. A special note of thanks to the administration for the collection and analysis of the data on which this report is based. The collection of this data involves a surprising number of difficulties. A system has evolved to collect and analyze the data in as timely a manner as possible. It would appear, however, that this system could be improved. It seems that the data collection is never finally complete until the "eleventh hour." Since salary recommendations for the University Campuses are determined early in the academic year, presumably the relevant information which relates only to our own Campuses should be available for inspection by the beginning of the Fall term. It is understood that the collection of system-wide data would not be realistic until much later. The more timely availability of our own data, however, would greatly facilitate the thoughtful presentation of recommendations by the University Campuses Senate on salary structure. Therefore, we request that this information be available to the Welfare Committee at the second meeting of the University Campuses Faculty Senate each year.

It is further recommended that an accurate data base be created for the University Campuses. It is apparent from a casual inspection of the 1983-84 data that different data pools were used. If meaningful conclusions are to be made concerning the salary structure of the University Campuses, it is critical that the data analyzed be valid. Therefore, starting with Fall 1985, we request salary information for the year be sent to this Committee broken down into two categories: 9-month unclassified employees and other unclassified employees (converted to a 9-month basis, e.g., 9/11 factor for 12-month employees).

2. The administration is to be commended for securing the 1984-85 supplement to the salary structure and for distributing this supplement on an individual basis. This committee recommended that the average salary at each faculty rank be modeled after the "Category 3" AAUP data; it is unclear (compare data in tables 4 and 6) whether this goal is met. Furthermore, in light of the data concerning the salary structure for Public School Teachers in South Carolina (see table 7), as well as the significant inter-system differences (see table 3), it is apparent that additional supplements to the salary structure are appropriate; and as recommended last year, these increments should be determined on an individual basis.

3. It is not clear that all of the members of the University Campuses Faculty have been provided with a clear explanation of the procedures and/or criteria used for determining merit raises (motion #3). Since each Campus seems to have evolved its own system of merit evaluation, it is suggested that the Faculty Organization of each Campus work with the appropriate administrative structure to insure that the procedure for merit evaluation on that campus is clearly understood by all of the faculty. One of the criteria for a merit raise should be that a faculty member performs his/her assigned duties satisfactorily. A faculty member who fulfills this criterion should receive, as a minimum, the percentage increase in salary passed each year by the South Carolina Legislature for all state employees.

4. The original goal of improving the promotional awards (specifically Instructor to Assistant Professor \$1500; Assistant to Associate Professor \$2000; Associate to Full Professor \$2500) is sufficiently important to bear re-emphasis. It is realized that this motion involves issues which impact beyond the Campuses level to System Policy. It is recommended that the administration pursue those actions necessary to insure the attainment of this goal at the System level. However, irrespective of any action elsewhere in the System, it is important to re-emphasize that future promotional awards should again be treated as a matter separate from merit raises.

5. It was not clear that the intent of motion #6 was honored. It is suggested that the administration actively study the salary structure for the University Campuses to determine if gender differences do indeed exist. While a casual inspection of previously collected data would not indicate discrepancies, a more formal analysis would be desirable. More probable is the existence of intercampuses salary discrepancies (table 4). While this type of study is more problematic (different campuses have different organization, different work expectations, different degrees of academic rank and teaching experience, etc.), intercampuses' discrepancies, if any, need to be eliminated.

6. The University Campuses Faculty Senate requests that the above recommendations and the following, which are reiterated from last year's report, be addressed as matters of policy:

- 1) Any low-end salary adjustments should be kept separate from the salary raises set by the State Legislature.
- 2) New faculty should be paid a beginning salary that is commensurate with his/her experience, level of education, and discipline, but not (except in exceptional cases) more than returning faculty with similar credentials.

TABLE 1
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AVERAGE
FACULTY SALARY DATA BY RANK AND YEAR

RANK	LOW		HIGH		AVERAGE	
	83-84	84-85	83-84	84-85	83-84	84-85
INSTRUCTOR	16.0	18.0	18.4	20.0	16.9	19.2
ASSIST. PROF.	16.0	17.8	21.7	26.9	18.9	21.0
ASSOC. PROF.	18.9	21.4	27.9	29.9	22.4	25.0
PROFESSOR	*	28.6	*	29.6	26.2	29.0

TABLE 2
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY AVERAGE
SALARY BY ACADEMIC DEGREE AND YEAR

DEGREE	LOW		HIGH		AVERAGE	
	83-84	84-85	83-84	84-85	83-84	84-85
MA	16.1	17.8	26.2	29.1	19.6	22.3
MA + 30	17.8	19.4	27.9	29.9	20.5	22.7
PHD	16.0	18.5	26.4	29.6	21.7	24.4

TABLE 3
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AVERAGE
SALARY BY RANK AND YEAR

RANK	UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES		FOUR-YEAR CAMPUSES		COLUMBIA CAMPUS	
	83-84	84-85	83-84	84-85	83-84	84-85
PROFESSOR	26.4	29.0	29.5	31.1	39.4	41.8
ASSOCIATE PROF	22.1	25.0	24.1	25.7	28.9	30.7
ASSISTANT PROF	18.8	21.0	20.6	22.1	23.5	25.3
INSTRUCTOR	16.8	19.2	17.3	17.3	18.0	20.2

TABLE 4
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES SALARY BY
CAMPUS, YEAR, AND RANK

CAMPUS	RANK	82-83	83-84	84-85
BEAUFORT	PROFESSOR	*	26.2	*
	ASSOC. PROF.	20.5	20.9	23.4
	ASSIST. PROF.	17.6	18.2	20.6
	INSTRUCTOR	15.7	17.0	*
LANCASTER	PROFESSOR	*	*	*
	ASSOC. PROF.	21.6	22.6	25.6
	ASSIST. PROF.	18.4	19.9	21.7
	INSTRUCTOR	18.6	*	*
SALKEHATCHIE	PROFESSOR	*	26.4	*
	ASSOC. PROF.	20.9	22.0	24.4
	ASSIST. PROF.	16.8	18.2	20.1
	INSTRUCTOR	*	16.6	*
SUMTER	PROFESSOR	*	26.5	*
	ASSOC. PROF.	21.9	22.6	24.7
	ASSIST. PROF.	18.6	19.5	21.0
	INSTRUCTOR	17.1	17.7	*
UNION	PROFESSOR	*	*	*
	ASSOC. PROF.	21.3	22.6	*
	ASSIST. PROF.	18.3	16.7	19.6
	INSTRUCTOR	16.1	15.9	18.1

TABLE 5
PERCENT INCREASE BY CAMPUS

CAMPUS	LOW	HIGH
BEAUFORT	5.3	18.3
LANCASTER	6.0	14.0
SALKEHATCHIE	10.0	15.0
SUMTER	5.0	20.0
UNION	5.0	18.0
LIFE-LONG	9.0	14.5

TABLE 6

AAUP CATEGORY "3" AVERAGE
 SALARY BY YEAR AND RANK
 (UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AVERAGE SALARY INDICATED IN PARENTHESES)

RANK	82-83	83-84	84-85
PROFESSOR	26.6	27.2 (26.4)	28.7 (29.0)
ASSOCIATE	23.0	24.1 (22.1)	25.3 (25.0)
ASSISTANT	19.8	20.5 (18.8)	21.6 (21.0)
INSTRUCTOR	16.4	17.2 (16.8)	18.0 (19.2)

TEACHER'S SALARY SCHEDULE

FOR 1984-85

Prior Years of Experience	Class 0 Doctor's Degree	Class 7 Master's Degree Plus 30 Hours in Ap. Prm.	Class 1 Master's Degree	Class 2 Bachelor's Degree Plus 10 Sem. Hours Graduate Work	Class 3 Bachelors Degree
0	20,772	19,086	17,399	15,839	15,144
1	21,213	19,477	17,760	16,168	15,450
2	21,668	19,883	18,135	16,510	15,779
3	22,189	20,273	18,526	16,875	16,076
4	22,713	20,664	18,917	17,257	16,441
5	23,234	21,054	19,306	17,623	16,793
6	23,902	21,693	19,728	18,002	17,158
7	24,446	22,046	20,200	18,370	17,540
8	25,043	22,508	20,673	18,748	17,903
9	25,645	22,990	21,153	19,115	18,255
10	26,249	23,471	21,633	19,497	18,620
11	26,859	23,951	22,114	19,863	18,973
12	27,470	24,431	22,593	20,242	19,337
13	28,079	24,909	23,073	20,609	19,691
14	20,689	25,390	23,551	20,988	20,056
15	29,300	25,872	24,034	21,355	20,407
16	29,910	26,369	24,514	21,738	20,772
17	30,434	26,741	24,903	22,087	21,125
18	30,876	27,074	25,237	22,398	21,435
19	31,319	27,406	25,569	22,699	21,734
24	31,466	27,555	25,710	22,847	21,734
29	31,615	27,703	25,868	22,995	21,734
34	31,762	27,851	26,014	23,144	21,734
39	31,912	27,996	26,163	23,290	21,734
44	32,061	28,147	26,311	23,439	21,734

Proposed Degree Requirements
USC-B Associate Degrees

<u>Requirements</u>	<u>Assoc/Arts</u>	<u>Assoc/Science</u>
English 101-102	6	6
Mathematics; Computer Science; Philosophy 110 (Logic)	6	-
Mathematics 121-122 or higher sequence (excluding 501-502); other higher level Mathematics; Computer Science; Business Ad- ministration 225-226; 291-292; Philosophy 110 (Logic)	-	9-12
Anthropology; Economics; Govern- ment & International Studies; Psychology; Sociology	6	6
Astronomy; Biology; Chemistry; Marine Science; Physics	6-8	7-12
Art History; English (200 level & above); Foreign Language; History (100 & 200 level); Philosophy; Music; Religion*	21-22	15-16
Electives	12-15	8-17
TOTAL	60	60

* At least two courses must be
taken on 200 level or above

University of South Carolina -- Lancaster
 Associate Degree in Commercial Science
 Advisement Form

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

SS NUMBER _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

<u>COURSES</u>	<u>CREDIT</u>	<u>SEMESTER ENROLLED</u>
<u>SECTION A - REQUIRED COURSES:</u>		
ENGL 101 Composition -----	3	_____
ENGL 102 Composition & Literature-----	3	_____
HIST 110 American History-----	3	_____
PRSC 117 Introductory Psychology-----	3	_____
PRSC 143 Introduction to Computer Keyboarding-----	3	_____
PRSC 149 Basic Economics-----	3	_____
PRSC 161 Fundamental Accounting I-----	3	_____
PRSC 162 Fundamental Accounting II-----	3	_____
PRSC 251 Small Business Organization & Operation -----	3	_____
PRSC 264 Computer Applications in Business-----	3	_____
PRSC 342 Business Communications-----	3	_____
BADM 371 Principles of Management-----	<u>3</u>	_____
	36 HOURS	

SUGGESTED ELECTIVES: PRSC 120 Effective Reading, PRSC 148 Fundamentals of Business,
 PRSC 150 Principles of Marketing, PRSC 217 Psychology of
 Interpersonal Relations, PRSC 250 Salesmanship, OTHERS APPROVED
 BY ADVISOR.

COURSES

CREDIT

SEMESTER ENROLLED

SECTION B - COURSES FOR
DATA PROCESSION OPTION:

) MATH 100	An Introduction to Elementary Mathematics-----	3	_____
CSCI 101	Introduction to Computer Concepts-----	3	_____
CSCI 205	Business Applications Programming-----	3	_____
BADM 190	Introduction to Data Processing or		
CSCI 140	(with permission of instructor)-----	3	_____
		<u>12</u> hours	

OR

SECTION C - COURSES FOR
ACCOUNTING OPTION:

PRSC 144	Business Mathematics-----	3	_____
PRSC 260	Income Tax Procedures or		
) BADM 335	Survey of Federal Taxation-----	3	_____
PHIL 318	Business Ethics-----	3	_____
BADM 226	Fundamentals of Accounting II--	3	_____
		<u>12</u> hours	

SECTION D - ELECTIVES:

_____		3	_____
_____		3	_____
_____		3	_____
_____		3	_____

12 hours

TOTAL HOURS IN A, B or C, AND D = 60 HOURS

~~COLLEGE OF APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES~~
 University of South Carolina -Lancaster
 Associate in Science in Secretarial
 Science

NAME _____
 ADDRESS _____
 SS NUMBER _____
 TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

AREA AND COURSES	CREDIT	TERM	GRADE	COMMENTS
Area A--General Education				
ENGL 101 Composition	3			
ENGL 102 Composition & Literature	3			
PRSC 117 Intro. Psychology	3			
HIST 110 Intro. to U. S. History	3			
PRSC 149 Basic Economics	3			
Area B--Commercial Education				
PRSC 141 Typewriting I	3			
PRSC 142 Typewriting II	3			
PRSC 160 Records Control	3			
PRSC 264 Computer Applications in Business	3			
PRSC 161 Functional Accounting I	3			
PRSC 144 Business Math	3			
PRSC 247 Secretarial Procedures	3			
PRSC 342 Business Communications	3			
	(39 Hours)			
Area C--Word Processing Option				
PRSC 243 Word Processing Concepts and Technology	3			
PRSC 343 Word Processing in a Simulated Office	3			
PRSC 147 Machine Transcription and Dictation	3			
OR				
Area D--Shorthand Option				
PRSC 145 Shorthand I	3			
PRSC 146 Shorthand II	3			
Area E--Electives				
	3			
	3			
	3			
	3			
	3			
Total Hours in A; B; C or D; E	(60 Hours)			

SUGGESTED ELECTIVES FOR TWO-YEAR PROGRAM:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| PRSC 148 Fundamentals of Business | PRSC 120 Effective Reading |
| PRSC 162 Functional Accounting II | PRSC 251 Small Business Org. & Op. |
| PRSC 250 Salesmanship | UNIV 101 Student & University |

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

LIST OF MEMBERS PRESENT

USC-Beaufort, 19 April 1985

USC-Sumter

Robert Castleberry
Robert Costello
Lee Craig
Don Curlovic
Jack Doyle
John Logue
Sal Macias
Jaya Rajagopal
Tom Powers

USC-Salkehatchie

Bob Group
Greg Labyak
Bill Bowers
Sherre Dryden

Lifelong Learning

Sally Johns
Elizabeth Mulligan
Jerry Dockery
Steve Dalton

USC-Lancaster

John Samarras
Shari Lohela
Darlene McManus
Jimmie Nunnery

USC-Beaufort

Rod Sproatt
Gordon Haist
Joan Taylor
Ed Caine
Lila Meeks

USC-Union

Charles Walker
Mary Barton
John Wright
Tandy Willis

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

LIST OF MEMBERS, ACADEMIC YEAR 1985-1986

USC-Sumter

Robert Castleberry
Mike Ledgerwood
Lee Craig
Linda Whitlaw
John Varner
John Logue
Sal Macias
Laura Zaidman
Tom Powers

USC-Salkehatchie

Marion Preacher
Greg Labyak
Bill Bowers
Sherre Dryden

Lifelong Learning

Sally Johns
Elizabeth Mulligan
Linda Holderfield
Steve Dalton

USC-Lancaster

Deborah Cureton
Shari Lohela
Darlene McManus
Jimmie Nunnery
Jerry Currance
Wade Chittam

USC-Beaufort

Gordon Haist
Joan Taylor
Rod Sproatt
Rick Boulware
John Simpson

USC-Union

Mary Barton
Harold Sears
Tandy Willis
Charles Walker

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RETREAT

August 4-6, 1985

MINUTES

Attending: Rod Sproatt (Beaufort), Ed Caine (Beaufort), Wade Chittam (Lancaster), Greg Labyak (Salkehatchie), Sherre Dryden (Salkehatchie), Sally Boyd Johns (Lifelong Learning), Linda Holderfield (Lifelong Learning), Tom Powers (Sumter), Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster), and John Gardner, John Duffy, and Mary Derrick (Columbia).

Dr. Duffy reported that President Holderman wanted the Distinguished Teaching Award Process reviewed. Specifically the review would examine current procedures on each campus and then recommend acceptable uniform procedures for the System (excluding Columbia). The Senate was asked to recommend appointees to this committee which would also serve as the selection committee for the upcoming year. It should be noted that serving on this committee would exclude that individual from the competition process for that year and for the first time, Lifelong Learning will also be included. These new procedures must be approved and all campuses notified by December.

Dr. Duffy and Professor Gardner discussed the funding process. The process is a 12-Step Formula based on a national model. The most critical factor for non-research institutions (which is the category University Campuses fall under) is student enrollment.

The funding level is broken down into three categories--undergraduate, grad 1 (master's level), and grad 2 (doctoral level). Student Enrollment also determines how many full-time faculty positions are justified. Faculty salaries are determined by comparison with peer institutions. Other factors which affect funding are maintenance costs (which are based on the payout from previous year, square footage, etc.) and administrative and other academic support.

The big change in funding is coming from a new method in counting FTE's. FTE's will be counted on a calendar year instead of only Fall. This makes the new basis Spring, Summer, and Fall. Spring plus Fall divided by 30 = FTE and Summer I plus Summer II divided by 30 multiplied by 60% = FTE. (Two Summer School Sessions means an increase in funding.)

There are four types of monies available to the campuses: a) that appropriated by the Legislature, b) student fee collections, and c) "External Funds," i.e., Federal monies, Desegregation Plan funding, etc. and d) and miscellaneous types of revenues, e.g., "E" "R" funds, etc. Each campus is a line item. Columbia cannot divert funding from one campus to another. The direct charge of 9% has been in effect for seven years. It covers System services, i.e., computer services, legal affairs, contract and grant accounting services, SPAR services, etc.

For every GRS student enrolled there is a \$46 per credit hour rebate to the campus. Although this rebate does not now apply to MBA-ETV and APOGEE there will be a payback associated with these programs beginning next year.

The Office of the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education had to supplement the Union and Salkehatchie Campuses budgets approximately \$20,000 each to cover faculty salary increases.

The local administration of each campus determine spending of local budgets. It is important to note that much of the budget is already spent or committed by the time it is received as approximately 75% of the total budget is salaries. Other line items are flexible.

Discussion of contributions to Educational Foundation revealed procedures varied on each campus and that a uniform system detailing specific contributions should be explored administratively.

It was discussed and decided that the Executive Committee should prepare a report summarizing accomplishments directly resulting from Senate action.

Grant overhead charges were discussed and "grant-seeking" was encouraged.

Professor Gardner suggested providing a workshop to teach faculty how to write for publication and how to locate a journal to publish works. Professor Gardner was asked to report to the Executive Committee regarding the feasibility of such a workshop.

The Student Retention Study that was completed as a result of Senate initiation by Professor Bob Rice will be presented on each campus and at the first Senate Meeting. Professor Gardner and Dr. Duffy will see that faculty are included in a campus level presentation. Dr. Duffy and Professor Gardner will invite Professor Rice to the September Senate meeting to report to the Senate.

Professor Gardner volunteered to try to arrange for parking passes for faculty and staff from the campuses in Columbia.

A Beaufort motion (which has been tabled by the Beaufort faculty) to invite union representatives to address their faculty was discussed. Professor Gardner, Dr. Duffy and Professor Nunnery suggested that this could have serious consequences. There was no action.

Dates for this year's Senate meetings were set.

September 20	Columbia
November 22	Lancaster
February 21	Union
April 11	Georgetown (Baruch Institute)

Dates for Executive Committee meetings were set all to be held at Faculty House beginning at 11:00 a.m.

September 6

November 8

February 7

March 28

The status of the Freshman Year Proposal was discussed. It is currently still in draft form and has been sent from the Academic Planning Committee to both the Curricula and Courses Committee and the Presidential Commission on Undergraduate Education. The Curricula and Courses Committee will be considering recommendations from the Commission on this topic. (Carolyn West, Sumter, represents the Senate on Curricula and Courses.) Intra-University Services and Communications Committee was asked to monitor the progress of this proposal. University Campuses views need to be well articulated.

Professor Gardner reported that the Presidential Commission Undergraduate Education has completed an executive summary of recommendation and has the first three chapters of text drafted. They are waiting on responses to these drafts from Commission members.

Professor Gardner explained that he did vote against University Campuses being allowed to offer four-year degrees from non-Columbia four-year institutions and his reasons for doing so

(the vote against this issue was 10 to 1). He also explained that the issue will be brought up again at his request and that the Senate should wait for release of the report which is to be delivered to the President by October 15. Intra-University Services and Communications Committee is to review and deal with this report when released.

New Admission Standards which are to go into effect in 1988 were discussed but no action taken.

The relationship between USC-Beaufort and Beaufort Tech was discussed but it was determined not to be an issue for Senate action.

Last year's Senate "Manual clarification" was determined to be in limbo. Professor Nunnery made the motion that Dr. Duffy forward the proposed change with whatever endorsement he deemed appropriate through proper channels. It was determined that the Office of System Vice President had authority to refuse change and no further action was necessary unless Senate wished to appeal the System Vice President's decision to the President and Board.

The group discussed items added to the agenda by Professor Nunnery.

The motion before the Senate from its last meeting "any person who serves on the local Promotion and Tenure Committee may not serve on the University Campuses Promotion and Tenure Committee"

will be brought before the Senate for a vote at the September meeting. Senators should be reminded of this upcoming vote.

A second motion "anyone who is in a position to evaluate faculty may not serve on Promotion and Tenure Committee at any level" will continue to be reviewed by Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

As discussed earlier, the procedural problems and discrepancies related to the Distinguished Teaching Award will be reviewed this fall. Suggestions should be given to the Senate Chair for representatives on this committee.

The instructional session for chairs of the local Promotion and Tenure Committees to be called by the System Vice President's Office to insure that correct procedures, criteria and interpretation are used during deliberations this fall was discussed as a point of information.

It was decided that the Rights and Responsibilities Committee should consider the entire concept of representation to the Senate, i.e., the point at which a Senator could be added or deleted, should there be a limit to the number of representatives from each campus, why representation is based on FTE as opposed to number of faculty, etc?

The responsibilities of 9-month faculty during "off-months" was discussed. Professor Gardner suggested this would also be discussed at the Dean's Retreat in September and he will report to Greg Labyak, Welfare Committee Chair, following that retreat.

Part-Time Faculty were discussed. Professor Gardner reemphasized the System Vice President Office's support for faculty input in the selection of part-time faculty. The Rights and Responsibilities Committee was asked to study rights, privileges and responsibilities of part-time faculty.

It was determined that Mr. Vlahoplus or a representative from his staff could provide more information regarding the Summit Fund. System Vice President's Office is to invite him or a representative from his staff to make a presentation at the November 22 Senate Meeting at USC-Lancaster.

All Senators were required to provide a list of members by standing committee assignments for 1985-1986 to the Secretary.

The following is a summary of assignments.

Welfare Committee:

Greg Labyak will check status of System increase for
promotional increments

Salary study

Question of responsibility of faculty during non-pay status

Non-designated monies of Summit Fund

Update: Summer School and Overload, Course load, contact
hours

Will change in FTE affect summer compensation?

Intra-University Services and Communication Committee

Freshman Year Proposal

Response to Lightsey Report

Continue work on faculty evaluations

Rights and Responsibilities Committee

Motion before Senate "anyone who serves on the local Promotion
and Tenure Committee may not serve on the University
Campuses Promotion and Tenure Committee."

Anyone who is in a position to evaluate faculty may not serve
on Promotion and Tenure Committee at any level.

Basis of representation

Part-time faculty

Executive Committee

Coordinate, plan, and monitor ongoing Senate business

Summary of Senate accomplishments

Ad Hoc Committee related to Distinguished Teaching Award

Office of System Vice President

Notify the Deans about the problem of restrictions on the
Educational Foundation Family Fund donation and how

these funds are being sent (inadequacy of information being provided about donors' intent).

Suggest to the Deans that they establish some sort of budget committee or have budget primer sessions to explain to the faculty how this year's money is generated and is being allocated.

Explore workshop on faculty research/writing activities (Professor Gardner has written a letter to potential consultants).

Have Deans set up faculty meetings to discuss retention data generated by Bob Rice.

Notify Bob Rice of Senate date for presentation and have copies made of his report for all the University Campuses faculty (to be distributed at the September Senate meeting and taken back to the Campuses by the Senators). (John Gardner has done a letter to Bob Rice).

Discuss with Assistant Vice President Danny Baker the problem of parking for University Campuses faculty who may come to Columbia. (Professor Gardner held a meeting to discuss this and visitor decals have been provided).

Check President Holderman's and Provost Borkowski's calendars for September's Faculty Senate "Report of University Officers"

Obtain meeting room in Faculty House for September 6, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting and for September 20 Senate Meeting (it has been requested that

we try to obtain the same space we used last year in the Daniel Management Center) (The Faculty House has been reserved for September and November Executive Committee Meetings).

Make arrangements for September Senate Meeting.

Make arrangements for the April Senate Meeting at Baruch in Georgetown. John Gardner has written Wendy Allen to arrange this meeting.

Appoint a committee consisting of the chairpersons of the local Tenure and Promotion Committees for the purpose of coming to Columbia to meet with legal counsel and to discuss the correct procedures for the conduct of tenure and promotion review.

Discuss the concept of "Terms of Employment" as specified in the Faculty Manual for nine months faculty at the Deans' Retreat

Request Mr. Vlahoplus to meet with the Senate on November 22 in Lancaster to discuss the allocation of Summit Funds. (He has accepted for himself and for his representative Harriet Wunder)

Appoint Ad Hoc Committee on Distinguished Teaching Award

Mary Derrick

Recording Secretary