UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MEETING

USC-COLUMBIA

MINUTES: 20 SEPTEMBER 1985

INFORMAL SESSION

Chairman Rod Sproatt opened the session and introduced Linda Allman, the new Director of the University's Library Processing Center. He also announced that Professor David Rembert, Chairman of the USC-Columbia Faculty Senate, would join the meeting for the afternoon session.

Chairman Sproatt called for introductions of new senators. These senators are: Marian Preacher (Salkehatchie), Ed Wade (Lancaster), Somers Miller and John Simpson (Beaufort).

DEANS' REMARKS

Dean Ron Tuttle (Beaufort) stated that although the FTE figures were down by about 6%, Beaufort had concenterated this year on recruiting the traditional freshman directly out of high school and had concentrated on attracting better students. He said that the number of freshmen had doubled and the average SAT score for entering freshmen had risen by 80 points. He added that the Hilton Head program continues to grow and that Billy Cordray, formerly at Salkehatchie, had "seen the light and transferred to a stronger and better institution--USC-Beaufort" where he now directs the Hilton Head operation.

Dean Pete Arnold (Lancaster) reported a modest enrollment increase for the Fall semester in both head count and FTE. He said that USC-Lancaster is initiating several interesting programs, one of which involves working with the local school systems' students in talented and gifted programs. He extended an invitation to the senate to attend a lecture by Robert Reminy, an authority on Andrew Jackson, on October 8 at 7:00 p.m. (No admission charge).

Dean John May (Lifelong Learning) reported that enrollments and FTE counts were up. He also announced that Dr. Sally Boyd's responsibilities had been increased to include Assistant Dean for Lifelong Learning and Director of USC-Fort Jackson.

Dean Carl Clayton (Salkehatchie) reported an overall decrease in enrollment of 4% but added that enrollment at the Walterboro campus increased significantly. The final percentage had not been determined as of this meeting but was

somewhere between 8% and 17%. He said that even though overall enrollment decreased slightly, some new faculty had been hired for this year.

Dean Tom Lisk (Sumter) reported for Dean Jack Anderson who is recovering from heart surgery. Dean Lisk expressed good wishes to everyone from Dean Anderson. Dean Lisk said that USC-Sumter had enjoyed a substantial increase in enrollment with head coount now standing at 1300 students and FTEs at 891, not including the students enrolled in the USC-Aiken program at Sumter. He added that average SAT scores had increased by about 30 points as well with a noticeable increase in the area of branch students. USC-Sumter now has a new Humanities/Health Sciences Building, and an auditorium and gymnasium should be finished by February. He extended Dean Anderson's invitation to the Senate to meet on the Sumter campus and use the new facilities. Dean Lisk concluded by mentioning that USC-Sumter had received a $200,000 Title III grant to install a management information system on the campus. Chuck O'Shields, Assistant Dean for Operations, wrote the grant, and a Burroughs computer network for office automation is now being installed.

Dean Ken Davis (Union) announced that at last count FTE enrollments at USC-Union had increased by approximately 21%. He said that he believes much of the credit for the sizable increase is due to increased retention efforts and a re-organization of the advisement procedure. He said that he believes another factor that will have a positive impact on retention in the future is the hiring of a full-time Graduate Regional Studies person, the first in 20 years for the campus, who will also work in the Continuing Education program. He added that USC-Union looks forward to establishing a permanent facility in Laurens in the near future. The President of the Palmetto Bank is interestd in donating one of the bank's former buildings for this purpose. He said that USC-Union has been successful in getting an additional $200,000 to begin the "second wave" of renovations of their Central School building.

Chairman Sproatt thanked the Deans for their remarks.

The Chairman distributed two pieces of correspondence between himself and Joe McCollough, University Associate Legal Counsel (see Attachment 1). The Chair explained that this correspondence was concerned with rules and procedures that "have not always been that clear in terms of the operation of the Senate." He added that some of the correspondence deals with the issue of membership in faculty organizations raised last year, but that "this particular inquiry" is concerned primarily with procedures, not "that one issue." Professor Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster), Chairman of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee, and his committee are also involved in this issue and will address it today. A motion

from the Rights and Responsibilities Committee is on the agenda, being carried forward from the last Senate meeting in April at USC-Beaufort. The Chair added that the Rights and Responsibilities Committee "will address that, but I want everyone in this body to have copies of this correspondence so that you would be aware of what that committee is dealing with."

The informal session ended and the senators left to attend Standing Committee meetings.

GENERAL SESSION

1. Call to Order

Chairman Sproatt called the General Session of the University Campuses Faculty Senate to order. He introduced President James B. Holderman to the Senate.

President Holderman:

President Holderman began by pointing out that his 2001 speech was a part of a plan that "emphasized graduate education in 1983, undergraduate education in 1984, and research in 1985." He pointed out that some critics had misunderstood his remarks and felt that USC was neglecting students in favor of research. He was quick to note that the mission of the University Campuses was "central to the core of undergraduate education" in the overall USC system.

He commented on the general enrollment increases in the University Campuses and predicted that this rise would continue because USC-Columbia has "slammed its door on the first of April, but not entirely," and has started a "new, very selective admissions policy. After a certain cut-off point, students will be admitted on academic and other criteria as of December 1, and all others will be held beyond early admission to March 15 when we begin to admit the rest of the freshman class. We expect 7000 applicants for 2500 slots on the Columbia campus for next fall which means the other campuses will have a tremendous opportunity to serve a vast constituency which is there and which feeds into the entire University system."

The President stated that it was his belief that students who "come to the Columbia campus from the University Campuses do better in their last two years than the ones who started on the Columbia campus. Whether that contines to be the case remains to be seen, but that is something the University Campuses can be extaordinarily proud of and can build on in activities and recruitment and work with undergraduates. Undergraduate education remains the high priority for the University of South Carolina."

The President pointed out that research was not "just part of

2001," but that it was "part of the challenge to the State Legislature." He said he was "increasingly optimistic that the CHE, Governor, and General Assembly will come up with the resources that will enable the University to realize this goal."

The President said that he has asked that committees be formed on each campus to "plan what the campus wants to do to reach their objectives for 2001." He would like the reports from these committees to be given to him by March 1.

Commenting on the desires of the 4-Year Campuses to include graduate degrees, the President said that this would not happen since Graduate Regional Studies was emphasized in 1983. Concerning graduate status for faculty at the 4-Year schools and the University Campuses, the President said that "Professor Rembert needs to take a message back to the graduate faculty on the Columbia campus to be responsive to the requests of full graduate faculty from the 4-Year campuses, and they have been, and for some of the 2-Year Campuses." This is "an increasingly important dimension of the whole system."

The President stated that the Lightsey Report would be out in a short time and "I'll give it to the Senates." Regarding their responses he said, "I'd like to take them to the Board in December."

The President asked for questions from the floor.

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter) asked, concerning the installation of computer fees for certain courses, "Where did this originate and where is it going?"

The President replied that if the Legislature approved his research money challenge that the fee could be abolished. He said that USC has had not "a single dollar appropriated for equipment in eight years," and the fee was necessary to purchase equipment.

Professor Castleberry asked the President about courses which had a computer fee attached but did not use computers. English 100 was given as an example.

Holderman: Does it use a computer?

Castleberry: No.

Holderman: Then it shouldn't have a fee associated with it. All you have to do is raise it with John and they will get it refunded. There is absolutely no reason for a course to have a computer fee attached to it if the computer is not involved.

Professor Sherre Dryden (Salkehatchie): Even if English 100 uses computers in one place but doesn't in another?

President Holderman: I believe they've made sectional exceptions. They have on this campus, haven't they?

Dr. Duffy: No, English 100 is a course which in Columbia is basically supported by the computer.

President Holderman: If it's not there, why shouldn't they be refunded?

Dr. Duffy: No one has made a decision. Basically, if it is computer related on this campus, then in this system it is considered computer related.

President Holderman: We will look into that. It may have been my decision, but I don't recollect. I think you raised a good point. Anything else?

Professor Tom Powers (Sumter) asked when the Senate might look at the Lightsey Commission Report, and the President replied, "About October 22 or 23, which will give you about five weeks. I don't think you are going to find the substance of it that controversial."

Professor Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster), Chairman, Rights and Responsibilities Commiittee, asked if it would be possible for his committee to look at, prior to publication, the sections of the report which concerned two issues his commiittee was to present at the next University Campuses Faculty Senate. The President sent the question to John Gardner who said that he would discuss in an informal manner the Commision's findings concerning the issues relevant to Chairman Nunnery's committee.

Dean Ken Davis (Union) mentioned that Dr. James Kulman had presented the 2001 proposal to the Union Rotary club and had pointed out that the proposal would not only benefit the University but all citizens of the state. Dean Davis asked the President for his perspective on how his proposeal was being perceived, even though it is still very early in the campaign to "spread this message."

The President replied that most newspapers in the state seem to support the plan, and that he perceives the key question to be, "Can the state not afford to adopt this proposal?" He went on to say that most objections to the plan can be traced to misunderstandings of it. He added, "We do fairly well. We don't do as well as we should on the budget, but we always end up at the end with money. We fight the battle for all of higher education. The man who does our work with the Legislature tells me that the University carries the weight. Everybody tells me that. The Commission tells us that. The

University of South Carolina does the job in the Legislature."

In closing, the President said, "I want to tell you how much I appreciate the job you people do. I am extemely proud of the University Campuses in this system. Every once in a while some fool stands up and says we ought to close one of them or two of them or three of them. It isn't going to happen as long as I am alive and at the University of South Carolina. They will have to take on everybody within the system to even introduce it. That is crazy talk. You have our commitment."

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the April 19, 1985 University Campuses Faculty Senate meeting at USC-Beaufort were approved.

Chairman Sproatt called the attention of the Senate to the previously-distributed copies of the University Campuses Retention Study, a 109-page document prepared by Professor Robert L. Rice (Lancaster). Chairman Sproatt introduced Professor Rice and asked him to describe briefly his findings and answer questions from the Senate.

Professor Rice began by thanking a number of people who worked with him in producing the report: Dr. Duffy, David Hunter, John Gardner, and the faculty and staff members on the University Campuses who helped collect the information. He pointed out the diversity of definitions the word "retention" has and said that "much of the information here in the report has been designed through operational definitions that were agreed upon in a conference we had last September in order to work out this report."

He said that one of the reasons John Gardner had approached him to do the study was because he had done a similar study at USC-Lancaster in the early part of 1980-81. He said that in a meeting with John Gardner and David Hunter, they decided "just to focus on all full-time students with perhaps the thought that we might look at part-time students at a later date." The groups studied are "Full-time students in general, full-time continuing students, all full-time freshmen, all full-time so-called regularly admitted freshmen with predicted GPA's of 2.0 or better, and all freshmen branch students." Professor Rice pointed out that "30-32 different variables" were used: information that was "easy to find."

Professor Rice concluded by saying that the report should be read with two factors in mind: 1) "There are a number of factors that seem to influence the retention rate on the Campuses that are shared by us all," and 2) "Each campus obviously has some unique factors that contribute to or detract from retention. Many of these factors are beyond the control of the campus."

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter) inquired if Professor Rice defined a branch student as anyone whose GPA dips below 2.0 and was told that was correct.

Professor Somers Miller (Beaufort) asked if Professor Rice had given any consideration to types of programs offered on different campuses, for example the special conditions imposed by military programs. Profesor Rice said that all military students were considered part-time and therefore were not included in the report.

Dean Ken Davis (Union) asked if the order of the System-wide recommendations on page 118 were prioritized and was told that they were not.

Professor Gordon Haist (Beaufort) asked several questions regarding the interpretation of the data for an individual campus and for comparison purposes. Professor Rice indicated that each campus must interpret the data themselves, but should not neglect to compare similar items.

Professor Carolyn West (Sumter): Is there a place in your report where your population size is indicated?

Professor Rice: I didn't put that in this report. That information is available, and if you would like to have that...

Professor West: That makes it very difficult to interpret your study.

Professor Rice: Exactly. That is another important point to appraise.

Professor West: I would also like to ask how, if I am studying this, I would compare retention rates on my campus with other campuses. How do I know what the variance is? For instance, how would I define whether 40% on Beaufort's was significantly different from 50% on my campus? How can I, when I am trying to make a judgement about this material, determine that?

Professor Rice: Right, well you can't without the base populations. You are absolutely right.

Professor West: Why did you choose to leave that out when you wrote the report?

Professor Rice: Well. I guess it was a question of readability.

Professor West: Well, I have a little trouble with readabilty because it will be a little difficult for me to interpret this.

Professor Rice: If you would like those numbers, I will be glad to supply them for you and we can do that.

Discussion of the report continued as Professor Sal, Macias (Sumter), Professor John Logue (Sumter), Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter), and Professor Somers Miller (Beaufort) asked Professor Rice to clarify sections of the report dealing with the interpretation of retention rate figures, his basis for certain conclusions regarding "difficulty" or "success" of retention, and the possibility of refining the data. Professor Rice indicated that "the intent of this report is to try to bring your attention to some factors that may be worth your investigation," and that he wished that each campus would use his report "as a kind of impetus to continue to follow-up and investigate. See if the things coming out in this report are really true."

There being no further questions, Chairman Sproatt thanked Professor Rice for his time and effort.

III. Reports from University Officers

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

Dr. Duffy indicated that last year's budget was funded at about 99% of full formula funding, and the Commission this year is again recommending full formula funding. Budgets are in line at this time with what was requested.

Dr. Duffy said that again this year the Adminstration had given the University Campuses' administration permission to use funds in excess of the money funded by the Legislature.

Dr. Duffy mentioned a study being done by the Commission on Higher Education and that he had met with some of the people doing the study but could not tell in what direction they might be going. The Legislature put in a proviso before funding the study that the results could not recommend the merger of any campuses or recommend the closing of any campus or technical college.

Dr. Duffy pointed out, in reference to President Holderman's remarks, that he was anxious to see the reports forthcoming from the 2001 committees and would review them before they were forwarded. He said the President would visit each campus this fall, and that the emphasis would be placed on meeting with legislative delegations and community leaders.

He encouraged participation in the Family Fund drive, and said John Gardner was our representative.

The Vice President said that he has asked for each campus to recommend a representative to be a member of a committee to review the Teacher of the Year process in order to improve it and make it more effective. Any approved changes would be in effect this year.

Dr. Duffy encouraged qualified faculty to consider applying for the status of graduate faculty.

He announced that a new adminstrator for the CHE, Jeff Bartkovitch, along with two CHE staff members, John Sedusky and Al Cretch, would attend the afternoon reception.

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

Professor Gardner reported that the basic salary raise figure on both the Columbia and University Campuses was 5.5%, but that "we exceeded 5.5% on every one of our campuses significantly." He said he hoped to provide the salary data at the November meeting of the Senate.

Profesor Gardner said that the fund-raising procedure has been changed slightly this year by establishing unit goals rather than individual goals. He metioned the Staff Enrichment Fund by which any classified employee who gives any money to the Educational Foundation may apply for grants to be used for a variety of purposes such as travel to workshops or tuition fees if they want to take credit courses on their campus.

Professor Gardner reminded the senate of the new process for counting enrollment now in effect. No longer is funding based on one semester, but is counted for Spring, Summer and Fall.

Professor Gardner indicated that the Lightsey Commission was preparing for a retreat to try to reach concensus in a few areas of disagreement.

He encouraged all campuses to continue in their efforts to get grants and mentioned that the College of Education was planning a workshop for Federal grants. He also encouraged interested faculty to apply for the Carolina Venture Fund.

He announced the annual Freshman Year Experience Conference would be held in February.

He mentioned that a meeting had been set up with the Chairmen of local Tenure and Promotion committees with the appropriate members of the University Legal Counsel to insure that procedures followed by the local committees protected the rights of applicants.

He also mentioned new changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act

which would affect classified personnel, primarily in the area of compensatory time.

In reference to the Retention Study, he pointed out that it was done in response to a request that came out of the Executive Committee retreat the year before, and that the intention was to have Professor Rice visit each campus after they had studied the document, bringing with him any "revisional data" he had that applied to the individual campus. He said that Profesor Rice would visit the Dean's Retreat and present his study in detail to them.

He said that Jim Morris of Computer Services was working on providing a course in microcomputer competency for faculty to be taught by a live instructor, rather than being presented in a self-paced format.

He pointed out that a new suspension policy has been approved, and Academic Deans on each campus should have information.

In concluding, he mentioned that visitor parking decals for one-day use could be obtained from his office if faculty come to Columbia on official business in other than a state car.

Professor Robert Castlebery (Sumter) asked several related questions to Profesor Gardner dealing with the subject of policy items recommended by the Senate, specifically, salary recommendations. He wanted to know at what point, and how the faculty would know those recommended measures became policy. Professor Gardner replied that he did not have the specific information at hand to answer the salary questions.

IV. Reports from Standing Committees

A. Rights and Responsibilities

Professor Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster) reported that his committee had met with Joe McCullough from the Legal Office concerning the issue of an individual serving on more than one Tenure and Promotion Committee in a year and had been informed that this duplication of membership should be avoided if possible. A vote on a motion from the committee concerning this item would be called for under Unfinished Business since it had been introduced originally at the Beaufort meeting and had been considered a substantive issue at that meeting precluding a vote then.

Professor Nunnery also introduced a related motion: "Anyone serving in an administrative capacity who evaluates the performance of a faculty member may not serve on a local or system promotion and tenure committee."

The motion passed by voice vote.

Regarding the status of an item approved by the Senate but

not approved by the System Vice President's office, and regarding the review procedure in general, Professor Nunnery reported that "The Rights and Responsibilities Committee met with USC legal counsel this morning with regard to the questions distributed during the morning sesion of the Senate. Joseph McCullough, Associate Legal Counsel, advised that the committee work in concert with Dr. Duffy's office on procedures for the review of motions and other actions by the Faculty Senate. Dr. Duffy has been contacted by the committee, and we as a committee will meet with his office in an effort to draw a mutually acceptable procedure to recommend to you at the next meeting of the Senate."

NOTE: The motion this committee will present is included as Attachment 2.

Discussion: Professor Robert Castleberry asked if the motion just passed was a recommendation and was not policy. Professor Nunnery replied that like all Senate motions it was a recommendation and would not become policy until reviewed favorably by the Administration.

Profesor Nunnnery concluded by saying other committee business was pending.

B. Faculty Welfare Committee

Professor Greg Labyak (Salkehatchie) submitted the following report:

"The chairman reported on several matters related to the continuing study of faculty salaries. The Committee is awaiting the 1985 salary data for the University Campuses requested for the next meeting of the Faculty Senate. A response from the Deans of individual campuses to inquiries regarding pay increases (requested in an earlier letter) is also anticipated. In addition, an administrative response to salary recommendations passed by the Senate in Beaufort last April is being sought. One issue addressed in those recommendations, the desired increase in promotional awards, is being pursued at the System level by the University Campuses representative to the University Faculty Welfare Committee.

Much attention focused on the funding of University Campuses. The Committee decided to seek information on the funding process at different levels from the Dean of a University Campus, a representative from Dr. Duffy's Office, and another representative of the USC adminstration in Columbia, who will be asked to appear before the Committee at future meetings. Among the matters of special concern is the revised method of allocating funds to each campus (employing fall, spring, and summer F.T.E. totals) and the possibility of resultant changes in compensation policies for summer teaching.

Interest in tuition discounts or exemptions for USC faculty members and their families was expressed. The adminstration

is being asked why such benefits have been discontinued and what might be done to reinstate them.

Committe members are seeking updated information from their campuses pertaining to workload, overload, and contact hours policies."

C. Intra-University Services and Communications Committee

Professor Jerry Dockery (Lifelong Learning) reported for Linda Holderfield (Lifelong Learning).

The Committee has been given three tasks by the Executive Committee: to report on Faculty Evaluations, to report on the Freshman Year Proposal, and to review the Lightsey Commission report.

"1. Faculty evaluations are extremely varied on the campuses. All campuses now have copies of the methods used by all other campuses. These forms are for your information. The Committee has no recommendations for any standardization.

2. The Freshman Year proposal was addressed at the April, 1985 meeting. It has been forwarded to the Academic Planning Committee which, we hope, has forwarded our concerns to the Lightsey Commission.

3. The Lightsey Report will be completed October 17. The Committee saw no need to have a special meeting before the November Senate meeting."

Other items discussed were these:

1. The Committee would like to stay in close communication with our representative on the Columbia campus committee dooing the Resource Manual update.
2. The committee discussed the Branch student with regard to different advisement procedures, the amount of flexibility available to these students, and the desirability of retaining some of these students.
3. The impact of the proposed research facility on the University campuses and their mission within the system was discussed.
4. The role of University Campuses beyond the first two years was discussed.

V. Executive Committee Report

Professor Tom Powers (Sumter) reported that the Executive Committee had met August 4-6 in Beaufort and received information from University Campuses administrators, exchanged ideas among representatives from different campuses, and planned Senate activities for the coming year.

The Committee met again Friday, September 6 at the Faculty House of USC-Columbia and discussed the following issues:

1. The date of the last Senate meeting of the year was changed to April 11, 1985 with the preceding Executive Committee meeting moved to March 28, 1985.

2. The Committee discussed the computer fee and possible avenues of repeal or avoidance of it.

3. The Committee discussed last year's motion concerning faculty organization membership and determined to ask a representative from the legal department to meet with the Senate's representatives (Rights and Responsibilities) for some clarification. Professor Powers further explained: "It is emphasized that, at this point, the question of what the Senate can do when the Office of the Vice-President disapproves a Senate action has become separated from the specific issue--membership in local faculty organizations--which gave rise to it."

Professor Tandy Willis (Union), reporting on the morning meeting of the Executive Committee, added that the Committee discussed search and hiring practices of part-time faculty, class size and class cancellation policies, and the composition and voting eligibility of the System Tenure and Promotion Committee.

VI. Reports from Special Committees

A. University Library Committee

Professor Elizabeth Mulligan (Lifelong Learning) reported that this committee had not met.

B. Curricula and Courses Committee

Professor Carolyn West reported that the Committee had met five times since the last Senate meeting and had concerned itself with 400 and 500 level courses in Journalism, Biology, and Japanese. She added that a summary of this committee's work could be found in the August 21, 1985 minutes of the Columbia Faculty Senate.

C. Faculty Welfare Committee

Professor Jerry Currence (Lancaster) reported that the committee had not met.

D. Academic Planning Committee

Professor Greg Labyak (Salkehatchie), reporting for Professor Bob Group (Salkehatchie), said that the committee had not met.

E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee

Professor Doug Darran (Sumter) did not attend and sent no report.

F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee

Professor Tandy Willis (Union), reporting for Professor Allan Charles (Union), said that the committee had not met.

G. Systems Committee

Professor Rod Sproatt reported that the committee had met twice since the last Senate meeting.

On May 6, 1985 the Committee met and discussed the budget and strategies to get its approval.

The Committee met again on September 6, 1985 and discussed the following topics:

1. The President's 2001 speech and the general guidelines for the 2001 committees.
2. The Lightsey Report.
3. Encouragement for the Caribbean Cultural Festival.
4. The possibility of providing courses through Lifelong Learning to National Guard personnel.

VII. Unfinished Business

A motion from the Rights and Responsibilities Committee which was carried over from the April Senate meeting, being ruled substantive, was presented for a vote. The motion reads:

"Anyone serving on a local (campus) promotion and tenure unit may not serve on the systems promotion and tenure unit."

The motion was passed by voice vote.

VIII. New Business

Concerning the Retention Report by Professor Bob Rice (Lancaster), Professor Gordon Haist (Beaufort) moved that the pages that include normative conclusions, including pages 93-109 be deleted from the report, and that the Executive Committee, which commissioned the report, take it under review with the responsibility of either recommending or not recommending it to the University. He accepted a friendly amendment from Professor Jerry Dockery (Lifelong Learning) that a statistician re-work those pages containing those judgements. The motion was seconded.

Discussion:
Professor Carolyn West (Sumter) asked for Professor Rice's qualifications as a statistician and was informed by Dean Pete Arnold (Lancaster) that Professor Rice taught a statistics course on his campus.

The motion carried by voice vote.

There was extended discussion of the issue after the motion was passed. The final clarification of the intent of the motion was that Professor Rice would have the opportunity to provide the information lacking from his report that would make it more meaningful and to re-work the data to make its meaning clearer.

IX. Announcements

Professor Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster) thanked Chairman Sproatt, Professor Gardner, and Dr. Duffy for their assistance in connection with the Rights and Responsibilities Committee's dealings with the legal department.

X. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
MEMBERS 1985-1986

BEAUFORT

Rick Boulware	R&R
Gordon Haist	IUSC
Somers Miller	Welfare
John Simpson	Welfare
Rod Sproatt	Exec. (Chair)

LANCASTER

Wade Chittam	Exec.
Jerry Currence	R&R
Deborah Cureton	IUSC
Darlene McManus	Welfare
Jimmie Nunnery	R&R (Chair)
Shari Lohela	IUSC
Ed Wade	Alt.

LIFELONG LEARNING

Linda Allman	Alt.
Sally Boyd	Exec.
Steve Dalton	Welfare
Linda Holderfield	IUSC (Chair)
Elizabeth Mulligan	R&R

SALKEHATCHIE

Bill Bowers	R&R
Sherre Dryden	Exec.
Greg Labyak	Welfare (Chair)
Marian Preacher	IUSC

SUMTER

Robert Castleberry	Welfare
Lee Craig	IUSC
Mike Ledgerwood	IUSC
John Logue	R&R
Sal Macias	R&R
Tom Powers	Exec.
John Varner	Welfare
Carolyn West	IUSC
Laura Zaidman	R&R

UNION

Mary Barton	Welfare
Harold Sears	IUSC
Charles Walker	R&R
Tandy Willis	Exec.
John Wright	Alt.

Attachment I

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

SYSTEM LEGAL DEPARTMENT

(803) 777-7854

September 11, 1985

Memorandum

TO: Rod Sproatt, President
University Campuses Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: University Campuses Policy Revisions

I apologize for the delay in providing an answer to your earlier questions, but the research required the receipt of several sets of by-laws in order to reach a clear answer. I understand the questions posed by you earlier to be:

1. What authority is possessed by the University Campuses Faculty Senate to make revisions in policy, including revisions in the Faculty Manual?

2. In the context of that authority, does the review required under the policies of the Campuses Faculty Manual act as a stay of the effective date of policy changes?

3. Is there a distinction to be drawn between substantive matters and scrivner's revisions insofar as the requirements of the review policy?

Insofar as the authority of the University Campus Faculty Senate to enact policy and to revise policy, the language on page 12 of the University Campuses Faculty Manual is controlling:

> Functions. The University Campuses Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina was created by the Board of Trustees to act for the University Campus faculties, subject to review by the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees. The Senate has policy-making authority over standards of admission, registration, requirements for and the granting of degrees, the general curriculum, instruction, research, extracurricular activities, discipline of students, the educational policies and standards of the University System, and all other matters pertaining to the conduct of faculty affairs, except where that authority has been specifically reserved for the

> University Campus Faculties. These policies will be generally consistent with the educational policies and standards of the University and will differ only in meeting specific requirements of the University Campus System.

Implicit in this "subject to approval" language" is the fact that both new policies or revisions of an old one would need to be transmitted to the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees. Assuming the review and approval of all of the above and the formal approval and adoption by the Board of Trustees, the policy would then become effective. Obviously the right to review carries with it the right of disapproval.

Nothing contained in the policies reviewed indicate any limitation of the application of the review process so as to make any distinctions in the subject matter which must be reviewed. Caution dictates, and the policy mandates that all new policies and revisions of old ones, even including revisions of language contained in the Faculty Manual (since it is the written statement of campus policies for faculty), be reviewed and approved pursuant to the policy. Experience has shown that even apparently benign revisions may have far-reaching ramifications if not reviewed carefully in the broader context of the System.

I hope this explanation is satisfactory, and once more, accept my apology for the delay.

Joe McCulloch

Joseph M. McCulloch, Jr.
Associate Legal Counsel

JMM/jm

cc: Dr. John J. Duffy

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

(803) 524-7112

September 17, 1985

Mr. Joseph M. McCulloch, Jr.
Associate Legal Counsel
System Legal Department
Osborne - Admin.
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Re: Further Clarification of University Campuses Faculty Policies and Procedures

Dear Mr. McCulloch:

Thank you for your attention to the policies and procedures questions I submitted to you earlier this year. Your explanations were most helpful and as a result raised some new questions:

1. If a policy or procedure is disapproved by the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education, what is the status of the matter? Does it become encumbent upon the Senate to initiate action in the form of some appeal process? If so, what is the process and at what level does the appeal process begin? Or does the issue in question automatically go forward to the next level as identified on page 12 of the University Campuses Faculty Manual:

> "subject to review by the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees."

2. If the Senate passes a motion that is approved by the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education, at what point should the passed motion be presented to the Provost, President and Board of Trustees? It is my understanding, according to your explanation of the wording in the Faculty Manual that nothing, not even a word change, is offical until passed by the Board? If this is the case, would it not be in the interest of the faculty, that passed and approved motions be presented to the Board for their approval at the first Board meeting subsequent to the Faculty Senate meeting where action has taken place?

3. Do matters involving the rules governing the running of Senate Meetings have to be presented and approved by those in the approval process as stated on page 12 of the University Campuses Faculty Manual before procedures can be changed?

On September 20, 1985, two motions will be presented to the Senate, they read as follows:

1. Any One serving on a local (campus) promotion and tenure unit may not serve on the systems promotion and tenure unit.

2. Anyone serving in an administrative capacity who evaluates the performance of a faculty member may not serve on a local or systems promotion and tenure committee.

I would appreciate your comments and opinion on the legal ramifications of these two motions in the event they pass or do not pass in the formal session of the Senate.

I would like to thank you again for the time and effort you have put in on behalf of the University Campuses System in considering our questions.

Sincerely,

Rod H. Sproatt, Chairman
University Campuses Faculty Senate

RHS:mts

cc: Dr. John J. Duffy
Systems Vice President for University Campuses
and Continuing Education

Prof. John N. Gardner
Associate Vice President for University Campuses
and Continuing Education

Prof. Jimmie E. Nunnery, Chairman
Rights and Responsiblities Committee of the
University Campuses Faculty Senate - Lancaster.

Attachment 2

THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE MOTION

PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING ACTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

The Chair of the Senate shall inform in writing the Office of the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education of actions taken by the Senate.

If the actions are favorably reviewed by the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education, he/she shall so inform the Chair. The actions taken are then in effect.

If an action is reviewed unfavorably by the System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education, he/she shall so inform the Chair.

The Chair then shall inform the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee upon being informed of a negative decision shall place the issue on the agenda for the next meeting of the Senate. The issue along with the rationale for the negative decision shall be attached to the agenda. The Executive Committee may assign the issue to a committee or submit the issue directly to the Senate as Unfinished Business. In either case, the issue along with rationale and recommendations shall be submitted back to the Senate for a decision as to whether to pursue.

If the Senate decision is not to pursue, the issue is concluded.

If the Senate decision is to pursue, the issue along with recommendations shall be forwarded by the System Vice President through appropriate channels. The Chair shall be informed of the action taken prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Executive Committee.