

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
USC-LANCASTER  
NOVEMBER 22, 1985

MORNING SESSION

Chairman Rod Sproatt opened the session and announced a rearrangement of the agenda by which the reports of University officers are moved to the morning session and written copies of their reports will be distributed at that time.

A motion was passed by voice vote to postpone correction and approval of the minutes of the September 20 meeting until the February 21 meeting at USC-Union because of the lateness of the distribution of the September 20 minutes.

DEANS' REMARKS

Dean Pete Arnold (Lancaster) welcomed the senators and guests to the USC-Lancaster campus and called on Wade Chittam (Lancaster) to inform the Senate of the day's schedule. Dean Arnold mentioned that his campus had been awarded a Title III grant and a joint grant from the Springs Foundation and the USC Educational Foundation for the purchase of a cardiac rehabilitation machine for the P.E. Center. He also mentioned an upcoming Honors Luncheon and an academic convention for students in the Talented and Gifted Program to be held in early December.

Dean Ken Davis (Union) mentioned the improving outlook for the outreach program in the Laurens area and the possible acquisition of permanent facilities there. He pointed out the renovation of the present gymnasium at USC-Union and the expansion of its role on the campus. The facility will be renamed the Truluck Activities Center. He mentioned growing programs in computer-assisted instruction and word processing. He was hopeful that spring enrollment figures would reflect the intensive retention efforts administrators, faculty, and staff are making.

No other deans being present, the Chair reminded the Senate of the revised agenda procedures and at this point called for reports from University officers.

REPORTS FROM UNIVERSITY OFFICERS

Dr. John Duffy (System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education) distributed copies of his report (See Attachment 1) and answered questions from the floor.

Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster) asked if any decision had been reached concerning the issue of standardized eligibility guidelines for the Teacher of the Year Award. Dr. Duffy said

that those criteria would be left up to the individual campuses. He pointed out that the tone of the decision was that no faculty member should be permanently excluded from participation in the process. He added that the committee recently examining the Teacher of the Year process was only trying to establish guidelines, not rigid regulations. He emphasized that the committee would encourage some kind of faculty participation in the process.

Professor John Gardner (Associate Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education) distributed copies of his report (See Attachment 2) and commented on the popularity of the bus tours to the University Campuses. Elaborating on the issue of the Faculty Exchange program mentioned in his report, he emphasized that in certain circumstances, the recipient would not have to leave his campus to satisfy the conditions of the program.

Professor Gardner added that he would be willing to answer any questions from the floor in the afternoon session after the senators had read his report. The Chair suggested that Professor Gardner could answer questions at this time as well.

Elizabeth Mulligan (Lifelong Learning) expressed her appreciation to John Gardner and Dr. Duffy for their aid in securing an invitation for her on the Lancaster bus tour.

The morning session ended and the Chair dismissed the senators to attend Standing Committee meetings.

#### GENERAL SESSION

##### 1. Call to Order

The Chair called the General Session to order and introduced a guest speaker, Harriette Wunder, Associate Director of Deferred Giving, Development Office.

Ms. Wunder said that she had been asked to speak on two subjects: the Summit Fund and scholarships. She pointed out that the original goals of the Summit Fund were unique in that it would be the first University-wide capital campaign and in that none of the money raised would be spent on "bricks and mortar" but on development instead.

She said that the original goal of 35 million dollars was set by adding the amount of money being raised yearly to the amount that resulted from a needs assessment done in 1981 by an outside firm. This goal was reached and exceeded through gifts of various types: real estate, endowed chairs, equipment, and scholarships.

She pointed out that in the past fiscal year private gifts had increased on each University Campus and that the Summit

Fund is at least partially responsible for this upswing.

Concerning scholarships she said that almost all scholarship money is " earmarked by the donor" when it is given.

She pointed out that the "Clemson ticket money" generates about \$150,000 a year and that the Board of Trustees allots \$40,000 to minority scholarship, \$40,000 to merit scholarship, \$40,000 to need-based scholarships, and \$30,000 to be placed in endowment for four-year awards for entering freshmen on the Columbia campus.

Concerning the role of the Development Office, she said that they "do not go out and find money," but "we help you evaluate the people who support you," and "help you put your strong points in a marketable form."

Ms. Wunder offered to answer questions from the floor.

Tom Powers (Sumter) asked how the Development Office decided if and when the University Campuses received any unrestricted money. Ms. Wunder replied that there was very little money of this type.

Dean Ken Davis (Union) asked if some of the unrestricted money went to an employee scholarship fund. She said that it was called a "staff enrichment fund" that could be used for a variety of purposes.

Dr. Duffy asked if the Venture Fund money came from the unrestricted funds and Ms. Wunder replied that it did.

In response to a question from Tom Powers (Sumter) concerning the actual amount of unrestricted funds, Ms. Wunder said she did not know the exact figures.

In closing, she thanked the Senate for their invitation and suggested that anyone interested in consulting the Development Office call 771-7190.

The Chair opened the floor for questions to Dr. Duffy or John Gardner.

Responding to a request from the Chair, Dr. Duffy said that his office is investigating a variety of ways of dealing with the question of computer fees.

Wade Chittam (Lancaster) asked if the University was sending out computer fee refunds, and Dr. Duffy said that they were not to the best of his knowledge.

Tom Powers (Sumter) and Robert Castleberry (Sumter) asked a series of related questions concerning how the computer fee would be levied in the future. Dr. Duffy explained that he

felt that computers should be paid for, but that he did not want to charge students directly, but perhaps through operating expenses of the individual campus.

## II. Reports from Standing Committees

### A. Rights and Responsibilities

Jimmie Nunnery, Chairman (Lancaster) brought before the Senate a motion concerning the procedure for handling Senate actions. This motion was presented originally at the September meeting but, being judged substantive, was not to be voted on until this meeting. (See Minutes, September 20).

#### Discussion:

Robert Castleberry (Sumter) asked what the logistics are for getting out the information that a Senate action has been approved. Mr. Nunnery replied that an individual would either be informed at the next Senate meeting or would be informed by his Dean.

Gordon Haist (Beaufort) asked what was meant by "appropriate channels" that the Senate follow in case of a negative decision. Mr. Nunnery replied that, generally, the issue would go from the Vice President to the President to the Board of Trustees. In some cases, the matter would also go from the Vice President to the Provost. In response to Mr. Haist's comment that it seemed somewhat fruitless to re-submit an item through the same process that disapproved it in the first place, Mr. Nunnery explained that he felt that the procedure opened the door for compromise to be made.

In response to questions from Tom Powers (Sumter) and Robert Castleberry (Sumter) concerning the vagueness of the time frame these procedures should follow, Mr. Nunnery replied that the committee had purposely not specified a time frame in great detail in the belief that a certain degree of flexibility would be most advantageous.

There being no further discussion, the motion was passed by voice vote.

Mr. Nunnery presented two other motions to the Senate. Both were judged substantive and will be voted on at the February 21 meeting at USC-Union. Both motions concern Senate representation.

Motion 1 adds the sentence "No University Campus may have more than nine senators " (12) to the section of the University Campuses Faculty Manual dealing with membership.

Motion 2 adds this sentence to the same section, "If enrollment decreases, compliance shall be accomplished by attrition."

#### B. Faculty Welfare Committee

Greg Labyak, Chairman, (Salkehatchie) reported that the committee has received responses from the administration to salary questions, and had received results of a study of salaries based on gender. He reported that Professor John Gardner and Dean Ron Tuttle (Beaufort) spoke to the committee about salary issues.

The committee is reviewing updated information regarding courseload, overload, and contact hours policies.

The committee is discussing a resolution it received from the System Welfare Committee concerning promotional raises.

#### C. Intra-University Services and Communications

Linda Holderfield, Chairman, (Lifelong Learning) reported that the committee began discussing a response to the Report of the Presidential Commission on Undergraduate Education. The committee will meet again on December 6 in Columbia and, following that, will meet as necessary to complete the response which will be presented to the Senate at the February meeting.

#### III. Executive Committee Report

The Executive Committee met November 8 at Faculty House, USC-Columbia and discussed the following items:

A. In response to a letter from Robert Rice (Lancaster), the Executive Committee decided to ask for the base populations used by Professor Rice in his retention study.

B. The committee discussed the pending motion concerning procedures for handling faculty actions.

C. Tom Powers (Sumter) pointed out that both USC-Spartanburg and USC-Coastal were dealing with issues that the University Campuses Faculty Senate had covered in the past.

D. The committee assigned the response to the Lightsey Commission Report to the Intra-University Services and Communications Committee.

E. The re-ordering of the Senate agenda was approved.

Many other issues were discussed but no action was taken.

#### IV. Reports from Special Committees

##### A. University Library Committee

Elizabeth Mulligan (Lifelong Learning) reported that the committee had not met but would do so in the near future.

##### B. Curricula and Courses Committee

Carolyn West (Sumter) reported that the committee had met three times since the last Senate meeting. Some items of possible interest to the University Campuses are 1) the acceptance of the designator UCAM, 2) the reinstatement of PRSC 120 and 248 under the UCAM designator, 3) the re-definition of History 101 and 102 with History 101 now being European Civilization from Ancient Times to the Mid-

Seventeenth Century, and History 102 as European Civilization from the Mid-Seventeenth Century, and 4) the renumbering of some 300 level history courses.

Professor Gardner explained that the UCAM designator replaces the PRSC designator since certain PRSC courses that are offered on the University Campuses were dropped on the Columbia campus.

Sal Macias (Sumter) asked Professor Gardner if UCAM 120 and 248 could be counted toward a BAIS degree. Professor Gardner was uncertain about the answer but said he would find out.

#### C. Faculty Welfare Committee

Jerry Currence (Lancaster) reported that the committee had met and discussed the following issues:

1. HMO contracts
2. Opposition to a House bill that would allow new faculty members to opt-out of the State Retirement System.
3. Adopted a resolution regarding promotion increases, the major point of which recommends a percentage increase rather than a flat rate.

#### D. Academic Planning Committee

Robert Group (Salkehatchie) reported that the committee had met and had discussed the following items:

1. The 1988 college entrance requirements.
2. Regarding the Foreign Language requirement, it was decided to recommend to the Provost that students who have not met the requirement (two years of high school foreign language) must take two semesters of college level Foreign Language. The committee's interpretation was that this would also apply to Associate Degree candidates on the four-year and University Campuses.

#### E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee

Doug Darran (Sumter) reported that the committee met and approved a program proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Electronics Engineering Technology at USC-Spartanburg.

#### F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee

Allan Charles (Union) reported that the committee had awarded \$17,311 to eleven applicants from throughout the system.

#### G. Systems Committee

Rod Sproatt (Beaufort) reported that the committee had met and discussed the following items:

1. A time line for 2001 reports.
2. A formula funding level of about 96.5 %.
3. An attempt to establish an independent Board of Trustees for the College of Charleston.
4. Lynn Mahaffey is in charge of a system committee

to review University policy on personnel matters and to write a manual uniform among all campuses.

5. Dr. Holderman stated that the Lightsey Commission report would be given to the Senates for review.

#### V. Unfinished Business

Gordon Haist (Beaufort) presented the following motion which was seconded, "That the Vice President's negative decision regarding the definition of faculty membership in faculty organizations be taken up by the Executive Committee under the procedures approved earlier for handling Senate actions."

The motion was defeated by voice vote.

#### VI. New Business

There was no new business.

#### VII. Announcements

As a point of information, Professor John Logue (Sumter) pointed out that there are at least two sub-committees of the Research and Productive Scholarship Committee of which Professor Charles, who submits the report to the Senate, was apparently unaware. Professor Logue, who is also on the committee, suggested that Professor Charles might wish to contact him regarding the next report.

#### VIII. Adjournment.

# ATTACHMENT I

## Report to the Faculty Senate

From John Duffy

2001

President Holderman has appointed 2001 Committees on all campuses of the University. I am enclosing a copy of the letter which he wrote me on November 4 which has been distributed to all the Campuses. President Holderman on several occasions during his campus visits has responded to questions and what he has told the faculty at Union and Beaufort is that they should basically dream. He also introduced a concept of learning centers as a future role for our University Campuses. This concept would involve the bulk offering of courses from Columbia and from Four-Year Campuses on our campuses to support the needs of adult students in the area. It is my understanding from talking to the Deans that these committees have all been appointed. They include members of the faculty, students, staff, and other people from the general community. I believe that we should take advantage of this opportunity and follow the President's call to think in creative terms about where we want to be at the beginning of the new century which will also be the 200th Anniversary of the University of South Carolina.

### Presidential Visits

We have had very successful visits to Salkehatchie, Union, and Beaufort. The President followed his usual pattern of meeting with the faculty and with the students. He also met with the local legislative delegations and community leaders. The visits were personally rewarding to the President, and to me and John Gardner. The degree of enthusiasm and support for the concept of the University System on our Campuses is remarkable. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Beaufort faculty and staff for their splendid participation in the University Educational Foundation Family Fund Drive. In fact, I understand that Beaufort's degree of participation has been matched at other campuses as well.

### Bus Tours

At the request of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee we are putting together bus tours to the campuses. We have invited representatives from the administration and academic divisions of the University. The response has been overwhelming. We have over 70 people scheduled to go on the trip to Lancaster on November 26. We have also scheduled a visit for Salkehatchie on February 11. As soon as we hear from the Deans of the other three Campuses we will schedule visits too. There is hope that these visits will enable us to establish better lines of communication between Columbia and our Campuses.



### Distinguished Teaching Award Committee

At the request of the President this Office called together the representatives from the Four-Year and University Campuses to meet to discuss the guidelines which will be used in arriving at the decision on the Distinguished Teaching Award. Professor Joseph Cicero from Coastal Carolina chaired the committee and has been elected as Chair for this coming year. I will shortly furnish the Deans copies of the Committee's proceedings and the guidelines that will be followed in making the awards for this year. Deadline for materials for materials to arrive at our Office will be the March 1. We hope to be able to arrive at a decision as to the recipients by April 1.

### Budget Reduction

I want to call to your attention the possibility of a 1.5% budget reduction. The Budget and Control Board may well decide at its December or January meetings to reduce state expenditures by 1.5%. This is because there is currently a short-fall in revenue collections.

### Title I Legislation Strategy

I am including in this report for your information a letter which I received from J. Noah Brown, Director of Governmental Relations at the National University Continuing Education Association. Mr. Brown's letter deals with the question of reauthorization of Title I of the Higher Education Act. As you can see from the enclosure this Act, if passed, would make funds available for the development of integrative delivery systems in continuing education. It is my belief that the University of South Carolina will benefit from such legislation. If you agree with me I would appreciate your making your views known to your local congressional representatives.



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

*Start file  
③ 2001 Report*

PRESIDENT

November 4, 1985

Dr. John J. Duffy  
System Vice President for  
University Campuses  
and Continuing Education  
USC-Columbia

Dear John:

"Carolina 2001" will lay out in bold and imaginative terms what the university is to be in the year 2001. The university has never before attempted to assess the dreams for our university in this way and it is fitting that we do so now in anticipation of our 200th anniversary. This does not represent a typical planning procedure. Rather, it is a unique opportunity to think on a large scale about our future direction and goals.

The university is more than the aggregate of its parts. Therefore, our collective vision of its future will be much more than a list of individual desires and aspirations. Invaluable efforts have been made thinking through the Carolina Plans, the Self Studies, your own plans for the University Campuses and Continuing Education Division, and most recently, the report of the Presidential Commission on Undergraduate Education chaired by Dean Lightsey. These serve as a firm base from which to launch into creative and collective reflection on the future of this great university.

One must dare to dream to improve upon the present. But, the best dreams are those that have a reasonable chance of becoming reality. In formulating your vision for the university, practical matters must play a part, yet they must not stifle your creative aspirations. For instance, we can anticipate that the University of South Carolina will remain state-assisted with about 40-45% of our budget coming from state sources. But with diligence, our endowment will continue to grow and outside sources of funding such as grants for research and sponsored programs, matching grants and contracts will be secured at ever higher levels. The breadth of our vision should reflect funding realities as well as our best thinking about demographic, economic and political trends.

Dr. John J. Duffy  
Page Two  
November 4, 1985

The guidelines are purposely general in order to encourage your most creative thinking. I would like you to respond on three levels with summaries as described below:

1. A one- to two-page summary, double spaced, of your unit's collective vision for the University System. This should reflect expectations about where the university community will find itself by the year 2001.
2. The next three or four pages should provide a summary of what you would expect of your campus at the beginning of the 21st century and what ambitions it would have realized by that time.
3. The final section of the report should be five to six pages summarizing how you envision your individual college, department and/or unit as it approaches 2001. You should also provide suggestions on how your collective vision might be realized, as well as the priorities you might establish among its different elements. Feel free to forward any supportive documentation or plans as an appendix to this summary section.

We are all inundated by requests for reports and nagged by day-to-day immediate obligations. Seldom can we participate in the expansive process of articulating our dreams. As committees are formed and set out about their work, every effort should be made to seek out the ambitions of each contributing constituency. Your preliminary summaries will be due in my office on March 1, 1986. I will prepare a draft of "Carolina 2001" to be used in an early summer discussion with the Board of Trustees. The report will also be the primary topic of discussion at the System Administrative Retreat in late summer. It will then become the basis of my State of the University address in September, 1986. Your continuing input is critical to help inform the vision for our great university. If questions arise as you prepare your reports, please contact Dr. Ken Schwab at 7-3245.

As you might expect, I am not looking for reasons why something cannot be accomplished, but rather thoughtful suggestions on how our dreams can be fully realized. I expect that together we will share in the excitement of this opportunity.

Sincerely,

  
James B. Holderman

JBH/pyr



# National University Continuing Education Association

October 25, 1985

## MEMORANDUM

TO: John J. Duffy, Chairman  
Governmental Relations Committee

FROM: J. Noah Brown, <sup>JB</sup> Director

RE: Title I Legislation and Strategy

Attached for your reference and comment is a copy of Congressman Williams' Title I reauthorization bill (H.R. 3475).

I spoke to Celinda Lake of Williams' staff this morning concerning a compromise draft that she and Rose DiNapoli are working on. The compromise will be available by close of business on Monday, October 28. Essentially, the compromise will contain the following elements:

- A single section establishing grants to institutions of higher education for program development. There will be an program authorization of \$50 million, with a maximum award to a single institution of \$250,000, and \$350,000 to a consortia of institutions.
- Grants may also be awarded for research and in-service training for instructors at the institutional level.
- There will be a trigger that will be activated should the actual appropriation fall below the \$50 million authorization. The trigger would require that 60 percent of the grants go to institutions specifically for program development.
- There will be no adult literacy section in the compromise. There is little if any support for the inclusion of such a program serving a undefined population.
- Both Gunderson and Williams will not include sections reauthorizing the National Advisory Council on Continuing Education. Their intent is to let the Senate carry the ball on this issue. Reauthorization is included in the Hatch Title I bill and endorsed by the Council.

- Most of the remaining language will be similar to that in the Williams bill. The definition of eligible institutions would remain broad so to encourage the widest number of grant proposals.

Celinda indicated that it would be useful for NUCEA to submit some report language on auditing requirements for institutions receiving awards under this title. The concern is to caution the Secretary of Education not to promulgate numerous regulations that would work to discourage institutions from applying because of filling out endless paperwork. Kay has suggested that we talk with Hal Miller on this issue.

I would like to discuss this with you on Monday once you have read through the bill. Congressman Ford has indicated that he and the Subcommittee will accept a compromise on Title I, otherwise Tom Wolanin will include the existing Title I language in the House reauthorization.

If we are successful in the House, we can go into conference with the Senate and negotiate a conference report with Hatch's staff that may ultimately serve our purpose. I am encouraged by comments made to me by the House staff and I think we have an excellent chance.

Attachment

cc: John C. Snider  
Hilton Bonniwell  
Hal Miller  
Mary Pankowski  
Harvey Stedman

Report of University Officers  
University Campuses Faculty Senate Meeting  
November 22, 1985  
USC-Lancaster

ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT

Family Fund

Because the accounting process is not yet complete for the total Family Fund contributions from all our campuses it is not possible to provide the Senators with a final and complete report. However, all indications are that we had an extremely successful campaign and that all goals were met and exceeded. For example, USC-Beaufort exceeded its goal by approximately \$2,500 which is an extremely significant accomplishment for a small campus. Another example: USC-Salkehatchie had 100% participation of all full-time employees. To understate the matter we are delighted by this response.

Applied Professional Sciences Courses and Curriculum Changes and Creation of Two New University Campuses Courses

This Office has been working extensively with the academic administrative personnel of our three campuses of USC-Lancaster, USC-Union, and USC-Salkehatchie to coordinate and communicate with officials in the College of Applied Professional Sciences regarding curriculum and course changes in that unit. This has been necessitated by the elimination of the former associate degree programs and creation of new baccalaureate degree programs in Office Administration, Retailing, Media Arts, Hotel Administration, etc. A meeting of academic administrators was held on November 21 and follow-up meetings will be scheduled for the faculty on our campuses teaching the former Applied Professional Sciences courses. By action of the Columbia Senate a number of PRSC courses were deleted at the July Columbia Senate meeting which necessitated this Office to request the reinstatement of three PRSC courses (120, Effective Reading; 248, Secretarial Internship; and 299, Independent Study). The University Committee on Curriculum Courses recommended favorably the reinstatement of 120 and 248 and this was approved at the November meeting of the Columbia Senate under a new designator, however, that of UCAM. Effective immediately our Campuses will no longer offer any courses under the PRSC designator.

Alcohol Policy

Faculty need to be aware that in the course of their professional duties as advisors to student organizations, clubs, etc. and/or in the event that they entertain students at University sponsored social functions or in their homes,

that there are inherent liability risks if they allow students under legal drinking age to consume alcoholic beverages. Each of the University Campuses have been requested to draw up a written policy regarding alcohol use on the Campus and there are several basic guidelines which can be stipulated here. For example, care must be taken not to provide alcohol for any students who are under the legal drinking age (currently 20 and going to 21 in January 1986); if alcohol is served at campus social events care must be taken to differentiate between those who are of age and underage and to insure that those underage do not consume alcoholic beverages; no alcoholic beverages may be consumed or carried in state vehicles; faculty who accompany students on University sponsored events crossing state lines to other states must adhere to the laws regarding alcohol consumption in those particular states.

#### Byrnes Center Solicitation of Input from University Campuses Faculty

The reorganized James F. Byrnes International Center administrative and faculty personnel are extremely solicitous of having participation from University Campuses faculty in appropriate events. If you would like your name to be on the mailing list for events sponsored by the Byrnes Center please route your interest through your academic dean to the Associate Vice President.

#### Status Report of President's Undergraduate Commission

Copies of the bound final report, in limited numbers, are now available and are being distributed. As will be explained by the Chair of the Senate, the University Campuses Faculty Senate is being asked for a response to this report. The Office of the System Vice President stands ready to assist members of the Senate in providing information as to the background for recommendations of the Presidential Commission.

#### Faculty Exchange Program

To date the Office of the System Vice President has not been overwhelmed by applications for our faculty to receive support under the 1986 Faculty Exchange Program. To understate the matter, we would welcome and encourage additional applications. The time is rapidly running out. We will make recommendations to the President by Christmas as to applications to be supported. Please understand that this support does not have to be provided only for faculty who actually wish to make an exchange and visit another campus. Faculty are eligible to apply for support to conduct research and/or other professional development activities which they may pursue on their own campus during a summer session in lieu of teaching. For additional information please feel free to contact the Associate Vice President.

### T&P Workshop with Legal Counsel

At the request of the Executive Committee of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, the Office of the System Vice President arranged a meeting for the Chairs of our local T&P Committees with a representative of the University System Legal Office. As a result, University Chief Legal Counsel, Paul Ward, spent several hours on October 18 with representatives from all our campuses and with the Associate Vice President. The Chair of the University Campuses Faculty Senate was also in attendance. The purpose of this meeting was to have a general discussion of the extent to which our current policies and procedures meet current legal requirements for due process. Another major purpose was to sensitize the Chairs of the local committees as to the rights of all faculty being considered for due process considerations. Mr. Ward agreed to conduct further research on several questions and to meet in the future if requested by appropriate representatives of the University Campuses Faculty governance groups.

### Status of CHE Consultant Study of South Carolina Post-secondary Education

During the summer and fall terms officials on the University Campuses and in the Office of the System Vice President have supplied extensive written materials and have also met in person with several consultants who are working for the firm retained by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education to make its study of South Carolina post-secondary education. To date we have no report of what these consultants have found and/or will recommend. We will certainly keep you posted. You will recall that one of the conditions on which funding was provided by the South Carolina General Assembly for this study was that the consultants would not recommend that any of the University Campuses be closed and/or merged.



ATTENDANCE RECORD

11/22/85

USC-BEAUFORT

Rod Sproatt  
Somers Miller  
John Simpson  
Gordon Haist  
Ron Tuttle

USC-LANCASTER

Peter Barry (alternate for Shari Lohela)  
Wade Chittam  
Jerry Currence  
Darlene McManus  
Bruce Nims (alternate for Deborah Cureton)  
Jimmie Nunnery  
Ed Wade

SALKEHATCHIE

Sherre Dryden  
Marion Preacher  
Greg Labyak  
Bill Bowers  
Bob Group

LIFELONG LEARNING

Linda Holderfied  
Elizabeth Mulligan  
Linda Allman (alternate for Steve Dalton)

SUMTER

Tom Powers  
Mike Ledgerwood  
Robert Castleberry  
Carolyn West  
John Logue  
Laura Zaidman  
Sal Macias  
John Varner  
Jean Hatcher (alternate for Lee Craig)

UNION

Tandy Willis  
Charles Walker  
John Wright (alternate for Harold Sears)  
Mary Barton  
Ken Davis