

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
USC-UNION  
FEBRUARY 21, 1986

MORNING SESSION

Chairman Rod Sproatt (Beaufort) announced that the meeting would begin with a welcome from Dean Ken Davis (Union), proceed to remarks from other University Campus Deans, and then move to reports from University officers.

DEANS' REMARKS

Dean Ken Davis (Union) welcomed senators, deans, and guests and informed the group of the itinerary for the day. He went on to mention a 30% increase in undergraduate enrollment at the Union campus. Also, he said that a renovation program for the campus' gymnasium was under way.

Dean Ron Tuttle (Beaufort) said that the new Marine Science building was now open and pointed out that graduate enrollment had "practically doubled." He also praised the efforts of Billy Cordray (Beaufort) in getting a Hilton Head program started.

Dean Pete Arnold (Lancaster) said that the Lancaster faculty and staff had been hard at work on two projects: the 2001 plan for their campus as requested by President Holderman, and budget revisions to accommodate the effects of the state-mandated 2% funding cuts. He also mentioned activities related to Black History month, spring concerts, Honors Day programs, and History Day activities on both district and state levels.

Dean John May (Lifelong Learning) mentioned that enrollment figures were up considerably in his division.

No other University Campus Deans were present.

Chairman Rod Sproatt called the meeting to order and motions to approve the minutes of the September 20, 1985 and November 22, 1985 meetings were passed.

REPORTS FROM UNIVERSITY OFFICERS

Prof. John Gardner (Associate Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education) presented written copies of his report as well as the report of Dr. John Duffy (System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education) who was absent from the meeting (See Attachments 1 and 2). He then offered to take questions from the floor at this time or later in the meeting.

There being no questions, the senators moved to standing

committee meetings.

### GENERAL SESSION

The Chair opened the afternoon session by offering the senators an opportunity to direct questions to Prof. John Gardner concerning the reports of the University officers distributed in the morning session. There being no questions, the Chair called for reports from standing committees.

#### I. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

##### A. Rights and Responsibilities

Chairman Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster) read a statement drafted by the committee in response to some concerns which had been voiced regarding the lack of a specified time frame in the motion from this committee passed at the Lancaster meeting. The motion addressed Procedures for Handling Actions of the University Campuses Faculty Senate (See Attachment 3).

Related to their charge of investigating hiring and compensation procedures for part-time and adjunct faculty members, Professor Nunnery read a questionnaire requesting information about these procedures (See Attachment 3). The committee hopes to present the results of their study at the next University Campuses Faculty Senate meeting.

##### B. Faculty Welfare (See Attachment 4)

Chairman Greg Labyak (Salkehatchie) reported on the following topics: 1) An updated document concerning course loads, overload compensation, and contact hours was distributed to committee members (See Attachment 4a) 2) Mr. Milt Baker spoke to the committee concerning the continuing salary study (See Attachment 4b). 3) The committee will meet April 4, 1986 in Columbia in order to assemble the salary study. 4) A resolution regarding promotional raises which came out of the University Faculty Welfare Committee was discussed (See Attachment 4c). The committee feels that this resolution is not in the best interest of University Campus faculty, and Chairman Labyak will write a letter to the chairman of that committee expressing University Campus concerns.

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

Chairman Linda Holderfield (Lifelong Learning) turned over the floor to Gordon Haist (Beaufort) who distributed two documents to the body: 1) the University Campuses Faculty Senate Response to Recommendations of the Presidential Commission on Undergraduate Education, and 2) the Introduction and Conclusion of that document. Prof. Haist then pointed out changes made in the two documents at the committee's morning meeting (See Attachment 5 for the final, edited version). The committee moved that the report be accepted in its entirety. Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster) moved that the document from the

IUSC Committee (the Response and the Introduction/Conclusion) be divided into two documents on which the Senate would vote separately to approve. This motion failed.

Robert Castleberry (Sumter) moved that the body of the report (the Response) be divided and the acceptance of each response be voted on separately by the Senate. Gordon Haist (Beaufort) mentioned that although the committee was not opposed to changes in the document being made from the floor, the committee in their deliberations had already considered any recommendations made by interested parties. Chairman Sproatt called for a show of hands on the vote, and the motion failed by a vote of 14 to 8.

A motion to call the question was passed and the motion from the IUSC Committee to accept the document was passed by voice vote.

## II. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Reporting for the Secretary in his absence, Tom Powers (Sumter) indicated that most of the items covered in the Executive Committee report had been covered in the report of John Gardner (Associate Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education).

He mentioned another item which had come up regarding a change in current practice concerning promotion procedures. He pointed out that the committee had been informed that the administration would act unilaterally regarding the application for promotion of persons into the tenure track and that henceforth faculty members who wished to be promoted to Assistant Professor would no longer apply through normal faculty channels but would have their promotions acted on by administrative action only. He said that the committee had discussed this matter in their morning session and had produced a resolution that expressed the "sense of the Senate" (See Attachment 6). After some discussion clarifying the status of the statement, i.e. that it is a resolution forwarded by the Executive Committee reflecting the general sentiments of the Senate, the motion to adopt the resolution passed by voice vote.

Prof. Powers then introduced another motion which, unlike the resolution, called for specific action (See Attachment 7). The motion's basic recommendations were that those faculty already hired as instructors be allowed to follow faculty review procedures for promotion and that those faculty hired in future as instructors be clearly informed that their promotion will be an administrative prerogative.

A substitute motion was offered by Gordon Haist (Beaufort) (See Attachment 8).

Harold Sears (Union) raised the issue that the substitute motion implied that the promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor was normally handled through faculty channels, and he asked if this were true, in fact, system wide.

Professor John Gardner responded to this question off the record.

Harold Sears (Union) asked to whom was an instructor to apply for promotion to Assistant Professor. Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster) replied that according to the University Campus Faculty Manual, the instructor would apply to the local Tenure and Promotion Committee, if the institution had one. Professor Gardner said that since instructors were not eligible for tenure that Professor Nunnery was suggesting a "rather paradoxical procedure" in which a person was applying for "something he is not eligible for." After further discussion, Prof. Gardner added that administrative promotion at the instructor level had been, historically, the normal procedure at the Columbia campus.

Tom Powers (Sumter) remarked that, in point of fact, administrative promotion at this level had not been standard practice at the University Campuses, even though it may have been policy or procedure and that a new precedent is now being established by the recent administrative decisions. He pointed out that using the procedure followed at USC-Columbia is not convincing since the University Campus system differs in many important ways from it. In reference to financial reasons for the administrative decision, Prof. Powers asked what issue, then, could not be seen as a financial matter. He concluded by saying that any financial emergencies could be handled by existing means without "a wholesale overhaul of procedures that the entire system has been enjoying."

Professor Gardner responded that he had used the term "serious" not "emergency," and that Prof. Powers had broadened the scope of the issue and that Prof. Gardner's remarks were only intended to apply to the issue of promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor.

The question was called concerning the substitute motion forwarded by Gordon Haist (Beaufort), and the motion was defeated by a vote of 10 to 8. Discussion returned to the original motion.

Jimmie Nunnery (Lancaster) charged that the original motion from the Executive Committee was substantive. Chairman Sproatt said the matter could be held over until the next meeting or a 2/3 vote could be taken to deal with the issue at the present time.

Sal Macias (Sumter) moved that a 2/3 vote be taken and the issue be voted on at this session. The motion was seconded.

In the discussion that followed, Sally Boyd (Assistant Dean for Lifelong Learning) suggested that any motions related to this issue should recommend what the University Campuses Faculty Manual should say, rather than trying to interpret what it presently said.

Harold Sears (Union) suggested that the issue be postponed and turned over to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee who directed the last Faculty Manual revision. He went on to ask that if the motion were passed, would it be possible for faculty members this semester to be affected retroactively since one section of the motion clearly recommends a different procedure than the one that was followed.

Chairman Sproatt replied that no specific individuals were referred to in the motion and that the committee did not intend to refer to any case presently under consideration.

After further discussion, the vote was taken and the motion to vote on the matter during the present session was defeated. The motion from the Executive Committee will be voted on at the next meeting.

Continuing the report from the Executive Committee, Prof. Powers read a document from Allan Charles (Union) dealing with the hiring and compensation practices for part-time faculty (See Attachment 9). Prof. Powers indicated that the Executive Committee would turn this document over to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee who are investigating this matter. Prof. Gardner offered to include information relating to this document while his office is gathering information for the Rights and Responsibilities Committee, and the committee accepted his offer.

### III. REPORTS FROM SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. University Library Committee, Elizabeth Mulligan (Lifelong Learning)  
The Faculty Library Committee met on December 3, 1985 at 2:00 p.m. in the Thomas Cooper Library Conference Room. Ken Toombs, Director of University Libraries, announced the Audubon exhibition sponsored jointly by the Library and McKissick Museum. In connection with this exhibit, USC Press has published A Load of Gratitude by Associate Director of Libraries, Davy-Jo Ridge.

Toombs reported on the necessity of replacing the roof and the worn carpet on the main floor with non-state appropriated funds in the near future. He also announced that Alexander Gilchrist, former Head of Reference, was appointed the first Coordinator of Collection Development as of July 1st. Coordinating the collection evaluation and departmental requests for new materials are his major job responsibilities.

Elizabeth Lange, Assistant Director for Technical Services, reported on the public access online catalog, which currently is under study by a university-wide committee. Statistics based on card catalog maintenance and data conversion in preparation for an online catalog were presented at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next meeting has not yet been announced.

B. Curricula and Courses Committee, Carolyn West (Sumter)

The Curricula and Courses Committee has met three times since our last faculty senate meeting. Actions taken which are of interest to our campuses include:

1. Change in curriculum for Computer Science to include a new course, Math 174, as a prerequisite.
2. The addition of Statistics 110 as a statistics course for humanities and non-technical majors.

Other actions may be obtained from the Columbia Faculty Senate minutes of December, January and February. She added that, at present, the committee is discussing the merits of a core curriculum, and she welcomed any input from University Campus faculty. Prof. Gardner added that Prof. West was a very able representative to this committee and that her courageous stand on certain issues had benefitted the University Campus system.

C. University Faculty Welfare Committee, Jerry Currence (Lancaster) This committee has not met since the last senate meeting.

D. Academic Planning Committee, Robert Group (Salkehatchie) Prof. Labyak (Salk) reported for Prof. Group. The University's Academic Planning Committee met on Friday, Jan. 24, 1986 in Columbia. President Holderman addressed the group concerning his 2001 Plan and the Lightsey Commission Report, soliciting future input from the Committee. he expressed his support for the eventual offering of four-year degrees on University Campuses and his optimism that the programmed 2% budget cut would be retracted.

The Committee's next meeting was scheduled for Friday, March 21.

E. Faculty Liaison/Board of Trustees, Doug Darran (Sumter). Prof. Powers reported for Prof. Darran. The Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the Board of Trustees met twice since my last report. Action was

as follows:

- November 21, 1985 1) Approved: Program proposal for Masters Degree in International Law, School of Law, USC-Columbia (proposal forwarded with my report of November 21, 1985).
- 2) Appeal of T & P decision.
- January 30, 1986 1) Approved: Establishment of a Rural Education Center, College of Education, USC-Columbia (proposal attached).
- 2) Approved: Establishment of a Center for the Analysis of Policy in Public Education, College of Education, USC-Columbia (proposal attached).
- 3) Approved: Establishment of a National Center for the Study of the Freshman Year Experience, USC-Columbia (proposal attached).

[Ed. Since these proposals are rather lengthy, they have not been attached to the minutes. The Secretary has copies if you wish to see them.]

F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee, Allan Charles (Union) No report.

G. System Committee, Rod Sproatt (Beaufort) Sally Boyd (Lifelong Learning) substituted for Chairman Sproatt at the two System Committee meetings since the last Senate meeting because of schedule conflicts.

On December 5, 1985, topics discussed included:

Commencement dates  
2001 reports  
New admission procedures  
Legislative liaison  
Update on litigation in promotion case (hinges on question of confidentiality of T & P files)  
Family Fund - goal of \$250,000 surpassed by \$25,000  
Lightsey Commission - President Holderman open to reaction on Recommendation 6  
Uniform System policy needed on alcohol regulations

On January 22, 1985, topics discussed included:

The possibility that the 2% budget cut may be reinstated  
Commencement schedules and speakers  
A response from the Provost's office to difficulties in

the new Columbia Campuses suspension policy

Chairman Sproatt added a report on the formation of a new system committee called the Research Advisory Committee and indicated that Dr. Duffy had asked Laura Zaidman (Sumter) to serve. He said that the committee's primary concern was obtaining more research and development money for the Columbia campus (See Attachment 10).

#### IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Two motions were brought before the senate that had been introduced at the last meeting. Being judged substantive at that time, the vote on these motions was postponed until the present meeting.

The motions from the Rights and Responsibilities Committee are:

1. The sentence "No University Campus may have more than nine senators" shall be added to the section of the University Campuses Faculty Manual dealing with membership (page 12).

2. To the same section (page 12) this sentence shall be added, "If enrollment decreases, compliance shall be accomplished by attrition."

Both motions were approved by the senate.

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

No new business was introduced.

#### VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Prof. Gardner, in reference to the earlier senate discussions concerning promotion, pointed out that in item 11 of his written report a matter was mentioned that indicated administrative concern for the rights of faculty. He added that Dr. Duffy for years and himself recently had tried to maintain and increase a sense of trust between administration and faculty in terms of faculty governance. He expressed his appreciation to the senate for dealing with the issue in a professional and non-personal manner and promised that his office would be working closely with the Executive Committee.

Chairman Sproatt praised the recently-concluded Conference on the Freshman Year Experience held in Columbia.

He announced that the next meeting of the senate would be in Columbia, April 11, 1986.

#### VI. ADJOURNMENT



# Attachment 1

## JOHN DUFFY'S REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE February 21, 1986, Union, SC

I would like to cover several topics which I think might be of interest to the member of the University Campuses' Faculty Senate.

First, let me comment on the budget. At this point in time we are still facing a two-percent cut in this year's budget and it is possible that we might start with either the same base next year or two-percent less. The House Ways and Means Committee has been engaged in preparing the whole appropriations bill for presentation to the House. This will probably be done in the within the next few weeks. At this point the Committee has restored the two-percent to next year's budget.

Of some concern to this Office is the budget at the Federal level. On March 1 the Gramm, Rudman, Hollings Act automatic cuts will go into effect. This will have an impact on student financial aid next year to the degree of \$200,000,000 nationally. I have asked Ms. Sallie Glover, the Director for Financial Aid for University and Four-Year Campuses, to give me some idea of how this might impact on our System and the Four-Year Campuses. She has prepared a memo on this issue which is attached to these remarks. As you can see, more than 100 students will be affect by these cuts. I am also enclosing a legislative alert on this topic and the total impact of the Administration's proposal budget on higher education.

On a more pleasant note I would like to report to you that the Lancaster and Salkehatchie Campuses acted on our recommendation that they invite academic and business representatives from the Columbia Campus to tour their facilities. On the Salkehatchie trip we had more than 60 people and on the Lancaster trip about 70 people. The response from the Columbia visitors and from the faculty and staff on the University Campuses has been very enthusiastic. I hope that other campuses will follow through and schedule such occasions on their campuses during this calendar year. One of the people who visited with us at Lancaster was Dr. Jeff Bartkovich of the Commission on Higher Education who I think, from his reaction, learned a great deal about the Salkehatchie Campus from this visit. Jeff also visited the Walterboro facility and as soon as his schedule permits plans for a follow-up visit.

Mr. Jack Whitener and Dean Ken Davis hosted a visit by Dr. Howard Boozer, the retiring Executive Director of the Commission to that Campus, last month. Dr. Boozer was presented with a plaque for his service to higher education in South Carolina. This also was a very successful visit. It is my understanding that sometime within the next month, Mr. Fred Sheheen, the current Chairman of the Commission, will visit the Union Campus as well.

At the last Assembly of Librarians Retreat at Spartanburg the issue of insufficient money to purchase books for GRS came up. It is unfortunate that since the GRS budget is already running a

deficit because of instructional costs, we have not been able to identify a source of revenue for books to support the program. It is my intention to build such support for insertion into the budget for presentation to the administration in the Spring.

The 2001 Plan for the University Campuses and for the Division of Continuing Education is proceeding according to schedule. After I have had a chance to review them, I plan to share them with the Faculty at an appropriate Senate meeting.

The CHE consultants report has now been given to the Commission on Higher Education. Basically, the report calls for strengthening of the Commission's powers. It is critical of the State for failing to fund research at the university level. What is interesting is that the consultants did not feel that the problem of duplication is as great as it is perceived. It did note some duplication at Sumter and at Beaufort. We hope that these campuses will address this problem with the technical colleges.

As you are probably aware, a study is being undertaken by the Commission on the question of the location of the library in Sumter. I have not received any information on how that is progressing at this time.

The University has recently acquired through the Foundation, a bank in Laurens. Plans are now underway to renovate this facility so that it can be used for classes in that area.

John Gardner and I, at this point, are studying the question of assessment and outcomes in our institutions. This will become quite important as we approach the Southern Association's visits to our campuses officially in 1991. Planning of these visits will have to begin in 1989.

Let me at this point congratulate the faculty and staff of the Campuses and our Division for donating the highest per capita donation of \$177.29 to the Family Fund. The next highest group was Aiken with \$164.13 while the System average is \$109.21.

Finally, let me apologize to the Senate that I am not here to comment personally on this report, since I am obligated to attend the President's System Student Panel. I am sure that Professor Gardner can answer any questions which you might have about any part of this report. Best wishes in your deliberations.



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

UNIVERSITY & FOUR YEAR CAMPUSES OFFICE

(803) 777-4800

TO: Dr. John Duffy  
 FROM: *Sallie* Sallie M. Glover  
 SUBJECT: Student Aid Projected Reduction  
 DATE: February 12, 1986

The following is a projection on how the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Deficit Reduction Act will impact the University and Four Year Campuses.

| <u>Program</u> | <u>Current Funding Levels</u> | <u>Sequestered Budget Authority</u> | <u>Projected 86-87 Funding Levels</u> |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Pell           | \$2,725,128                   | \$280,688 (10.3%)                   | \$2,444,440                           |
| CWS            | 523,461                       | 22,509                              | 500,952                               |
| SEOG           | 101,186                       | 4,351                               | 96,835                                |
| NDSL (FCC)     | 230,000                       | 9,890                               | 220,110                               |

If the Department of Education adheres to its linear reduction formula, 922 currently eligible students will experience a reduction in their Pell Grant awards while 105 would be eliminated from the program.

SMG/ppm  
 cc: Mr. John Gardner



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

(803) 777-7190

February 12, 1986

*John Gardner*  
*JHC*

Mr. John Gardner  
Associate Vice President  
University Campuses and Continuing  
Education  
USC Columbia

Dear John:

The per capita figures you mentioned to me for your division were right on target. I calculated an average gift of \$177.29 for University Campuses and Continuing Education. The next highest is \$164.13 for Aiken while the System average is \$109.21.

Congratulations on an outstanding job!

Sincerely,

*JHC*  
Joseph H. Chandler  
Director of Corporate Relations

JHC/sj



February 14, 1986

CONTACT:

J. Noah Brown  
Director of Governmental Relations  
202/659-3130

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET THREATENS TO SLASH AID TO PART-TIME STUDENTS

Notwithstanding a recent federal court ruling declaring a portion of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 unconstitutional, the current federal budget will be cut March 1 by \$11.7 billion. Continuing higher education would be immediately affected --

Student Aid - Federal student aid programs, which constitute approximately 75 percent of all student aid nationally, will be cut by \$209 million or 4.3 percent. PELL grants would take the largest hit, losing more than \$153 million.

Graduate Programs - Federal graduate support programs, including federal graduate fellowships, will be cut by almost \$1 million or 4.5 percent.

FIPSE - The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) will be cut by \$500,000 or 4 percent.

Veterans Benefits - Education and training benefits for veterans would be reduced by 8.7 percent, and 13.1 percent for vocational education programs.

In addition, President Reagan is asking Congress to trim another \$201 million from federal student aid, and \$2.2 million from FIPSE during the current academic year.

Each of these cuts will occur on March 1, leaving only seven months remaining in the fiscal year in which to make program adjustments.

President's Budget for FY 1987

President Reagan's FY 1987 budget, which would take effect October 1, asks Congress to cut federal student aid by more than \$1.1 billion. Federal graduate programs would be eliminated under President Reagan's budget, as well as several institutional aid programs. President Reagan is also asking Congress to eliminate the new GI Bill on October 1, thereby reverting to the old Veterans Educational Assistance Program (VEAP) of matching contributions.

Additionally, President Reagan would like to make the following changes on October 1 to federal student aid programs:

-more-



- restructure the NDSL program on an unsubsidized, income-contingent repayment basis;
- peg a GSL borrower's interest rate to the average 91-day Treasury bill beginning in the current school year (1986-87);
- increase the expected family contribution in the PELL program, effectively eliminating eligibility of students with family incomes over \$23,400;
- make any student who is 22 years old or younger considered as a dependent unless he or she is an orphan or ward of the court, or can demonstrate self-sufficiency for the two years prior to the year application for aid is submitted;
- make lenders responsible for 10 percent of the costs of borrower defaults, as well as sharing administrative costs of the GSL program;
- require all recipients of aid to have a high school diploma or the equivalent;
- require schools to share in the costs of administering aid programs without reimbursement;
- require a minimum \$800 self-help contribution by all students receiving aid; and,
- raise the expected family contribution assessment rates, resulting in less aid for students of middle and upper family income brackets.

The U.S. Department of Education conservatively estimates that if Congress approved President Reagan's FY 1987 budget, 2.3 million fewer student aid awards would be made, and 1.4 million fewer students would receive federal student aid.

For example, the proposal to change the age definition for independent students would severely reduce the amount of aid that working adult, part-time students with dependents are eligible to receive under current law. The net effect would be to force many students under 23 to curtail their education and training activities.

Virtually every federal program important to continuing higher education faces cutbacks or elimination. Congress is now setting federal spending priorities for the coming year. Continuing higher education must make its case now on Capitol Hill.

You are urged to contact members of your congressional delegation as soon as possible to voice your concern. You should stress the special importance of continuing higher education in meeting the present and future human resource needs of our nation. NUCEA's national office will continue to work to defend those programs critical to your institution, but we need your help now.

Finally, NUCEA may have an opportunity to testify in the coming months before Congress on the effects of federal budget cutbacks and proposed changes to student aid programs. Any information you can provide would be helpful. Specifically, the NUCEA national office staff would be interested in the following: (1) adjustments to your programs you anticipate having to make; (2) estimated number of part-time students receiving federal assistance as a proportion of your program enrollment; (3) age breakdown and dependent/independent status of students in your programs; and (4) estimated number of students who might lose or receive reduced assistance.

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MEETING:  
USC-UNION  
February 21, 1986

REPORTS OF UNIVERSITY OFFICERS

Report of the Associate Vice President for  
University Campuses and Continuing Education

1. Faculty Exchange Applications.

Applications are submitted each year for faculty exchange support during the following academic year. Therefore, in the fall of 1985 a total of thirty applications were submitted from all 9 Campuses for support during the 1986-87 academic year. Of these 30 applications, 10 were from the University Campuses and 9 received funded support. Of the remaining applications, one was from Columbia and the balance were from the Four-Year Campuses. Of the total of 30 submitted, 21 were funded. I congratulate the members of the University Campuses faculty on their unique, imaginative, substantive, and scholarly proposals and I am delighted with the success they have achieved in receiving support. I would be happy to work next fall with faculty who are interested in submitting applications and I would advise that those who would make such application be sure to stress in their proposals the use of more than one Campus in the University System during the faculty exchange project. This does not necessarily require you to live on another Campus but it does enhance the probability of funding if you describe very specifically how you will use the resources of the University to enhance your faculty development (resources such as the computers, libraries, faculty colleagues on other campuses, etc.). In fact, I would strongly urge to informally consult with me in advance of your formal application so that I could attempt to render advice that might enhance the probability of your being funded.

2. Review of System Tenure and Promotion Procedures.

Important questions are currently being raised at the central administration level about the extent of consistency between and among our Campuses of the University System. Special attention is being paid to variations in which the review proceedings are held confidential, particularly after the file has been submitted by the applicant. The whole subject is being reviewed by the Provost, the Chancellors, the Chief Legal Counsel, the System and Associate Vice President for University Campuses, and the President. To date, we do not know where this review is going to lead. As I have expressed to a number of you faculty both privately and in meetings, I personally think our System very much needs some reexamination and streamlining to make some of our procedures more consistent with those which are more appropriate to a univer-

sity. However, it is your tenure and promotion system and unless there are significant legal or due process problems with your system we in this Office in all likelihood will not initiate significant change.

3. Response to the Lightsey Committee.

There has been considerable discussion throughout our System regarding a number of the recommendations of the Lightsey Commission, particularly those 1) recommending a particular core curriculum for undergraduates, 2) the recommendation, which if adopted, that would preclude the offering of baccalaureate degrees other than the BAIS on University Campuses, and 3) a proposed change in "transfer" policy.

Regarding the Lightsey Commission recommendations for core curriculum, your own representative, Professor Carolyn West, on the University Committee on Curricula and Courses is the more appropriate person to keep you informed on that matter. Any action the Columbia Senate takes will bind our Campuses to such curriculum revisions. The proposed curriculum revision is being considered by the University Committee on Curricula and Courses and then will be forwarded to the Columbia Campus Senate in which our faculty are, of course, represented. As for the other matters under consideration, I would prefer to comment on these verbally.

4. Administrative Promotion for Professor David Bell.

One of our long-time and valued faculty and administrative members, Professor David Bell of USC-Lancaster, has recently been appointed the Associate Master of The South Carolina College at USC-Columbia. This is a position of prestige and significance and I think that all of us on the University Campuses should feel honored that one of our faculty members was chosen through a competitive process for this position. An administrative move of this nature raises an appropriate question as to the matter of his rank and tenure. As a result, his rank of associate professor with tenure has been transferred from USC-Lancaster to Lifelong Learning. It is important that you understand that this procedure was carried out with the full consultation and concurrence of the faculty of the Lifelong Learning unit, the Dean of Lifelong Learning, the Office of the System Vice President, the President, and the Board of Trustees. We wish Professor Bell well in his new position and we in this Office look forward to working with the Acting Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at USC-Lancaster, Professor Peter Barry.

5. System Alcohol Policy.

As some of you may know, the President meets periodically with student leaders from all nine Campuses in what is known at the President's Panel. One issue that has come up re-



peatedly this year is the apparent inconsistency between various Campuses policies regarding alcohol use by students. The President seems to have been moving towards a more standardized policy for all Campuses which would be more stringent than that now found on some Campuses. The matter is under continuing advisement and study and our own David Hunter who has responsibility for coordination of Student Services for the five University Campuses is being most helpful to us as we pursue this important matter. David is also working on this with the Columbia Vice President for Student Affairs, Dennis Pruitt, Chief University Legal Counsel, Paul Ward, and Associate Counsel, Lynn Hensel. The Associate Vice President is also involved in these discussions.

6. Participation of University Campuses Faculty in the National Conference on the Freshman Year Experience.

This is to express my personal appreciation to the significant number of University Campuses faculty and staff who participated in this recent meeting. They joined approximately 1000 educators from the United States, Canada, and Great Britain at this gathering. I express my warmest thanks to my colleagues on the University Campuses who supported this activity in which I have more than a passing interest.

7. CHE Program Review at USC-Lancaster.

University Campuses are required to report annually enrollments in all associate degree programs. When enrollments fall below a certain level we can be and have been asked to justify continuation of such programs based on declining enrollments. This year we were asked to submit information on the status of steps that we had taken to enhance enrollments of two programs at USC-Lancaster: the Associate Degree in Commercial Science and the Associate Degree in Criminal Justice. Our response to CHE led them in turn to ask further questions about whether or not curriculum changes ~~we had made~~ in Commercial Science and Secretarial Science programs constituted, in effect, new programs. The CHE staff has agreed to resolve this without necessitating a full review by the Commission on Higher Education of these two degrees as new programs. We are encouraged by the cooperative way that the new Commission liaison officer with University Campuses, Dr. Jeff Bartkovich, has worked with us on this matter. Many of you will be meeting Dr. Bartkovich as he visits all of our Campuses and I would urge you to extend to him a warm personal and professional welcome.

8. System Historians Meeting.

Recently I was a representative of our Campuses at a System Historians meeting (along with other historians from the

Campuses, obviously). This representation on my part was due primarily to the fact that I was one of the members of the Presidential Commission on Undergraduate Education and the principal subject of the System Historians meeting was to discuss those Commission Recommendations. I did my best to point out the excellent training, length of teaching experience, and all the research activities, etc. by our University Campus historians and we compiled special data for this purpose.

9. 300 and 400 Level Course Review.

As many of you are aware, it is the policy of this Office to have all requests from University Campuses for our faculty to teach 300 and 400 level courses reviewed first in this Office and then by the appropriate Columbia counterpart departments for which these courses apply towards majors and degrees offered in those departments. In general, we have been having excellent success obtaining favorable review of the credentials of our faculty. In this process many of our faculty have been receiving extensive "kudos" as to their appropriate qualification and accomplishments. We have been encountering a few problems in the areas of English, History, and Art. It would be more appropriate for me to elaborate verbally on this if there are questions.

10. Family Fund Results.

According to figures recently released by the Development Office, it appears that three of the five University Campuses exceeded their goals. These Campuses were: Lancaster, Beaufort, and Sumter. Two Campuses had a 100% participation rate (Salkehatchie and Beaufort).

11. Criteria for Annual Performance Appraisal.

In December the Associate Deans for Academic Affairs brought to my attention a problem whereby a criteria of "Institutional Support" has been used routinely as a criteria for annual performance appraisal. This has been specifically listed as one of the so-called performance factors on the appraisal form which we have been using. The Deans have requested the deletion of this item because in their opinion it was "an ambiguous entry" and they reported none of them "feel especially competent about the sorts of activities that ought to be listed" under "Institutional Support." I have reviewed this matter extensively and also had discussions with USC General Counsel, Paul Ward. We have studied the pertinent sections of the University Campuses Faculty Manual (1983), pages 19-20, which spell out the performance appraisal policy and then the section on criteria for tenure and promotion beginning on page 23.

It would appear to us that the University Campuses Faculty Manual is most explicit when it states on page 19 that "unit criteria for tenure and promotion will be used as a basis of the annual evaluation." Then when one refers to the specific criteria for tenure and promotion on page 23 of the Faculty Manual we read that the criteria are as follows:

1. Effectiveness as a teacher and/or librarian
2. Campus activities
3. Community service
4. Professional growth
5. Research and/or scholarship
6. Length of service

It is obvious that item 6 on the performance appraisal form "Institutional Support" is not one of the criteria for tenure and promotion as specified in the Faculty Manual. Hence, that would appear to be not consistent with the preceding statement in the Faculty Manual on page 19 that the unit criteria for tenure and promotion will be used as a basis for the annual promotion. Mr. Ward and I agree that the item of "Institution Support" cannot be used as a separate criteria for evaluation for annual performance unless it is a criteria spelled out in separate unit tenure and promotion criteria which has been duly approved by the faculty and administration of the particular campus. The Faculty Manual on page 19 does define the word "unit" as "refers to academic divisions with established criteria for tenure and promotion." Therefore, it would appear to be appropriate for "Institutional Support" to be used if it is included as one of the criteria adopted by a particular University Campus. In the absence of that being the case, I have directed the Academic Dean to cease using that as a criterion for annual performance evaluations. We do not want to be in the habit of evaluating faculty on criteria that are not specifically provided for in the Faculty Manual or through a process permitted by the Faculty Manual.

The Academic Deans have also suggested to this Office that another one of the "performance factors" on the the annual performance appraisal form, that of "Campus Activities" be changed to read "Campus and System Activities." Because of the rationale explained above requiring that only criteria explicitly stated in the Faculty Manual for tenure and promotion be used in the annual performance appraisal procedure, this Office cannot make this recommended change. However, it is certainly our desire to see faculty rewarded for both Campus and System activities. Were there to be significant faculty interest in changing this particular

wording of the criteria, appropriate action would have to be taken by the Faculty Senate to in turn revise the wording the the Faculty Manual which would then finally in turn revise the wording on the annual appraisal policy form. I would ask the Senate to give this matter consideration as I think it has merit.

12. Change of Location: University Campuses Faculty Senate Meeting, April 1986.

Due to the financial constraints imposed by the recent 2% budget reduction and other matters of fiscal austerity facing the University Campuses and the ability of the Office of System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education to support such activities, it is necessary to effect a number of cost saving measures. This is in no way to be construed as any diminution of our respect and support for the tremendous importance of faculty governance activities. However, the planned location for the April 1986 University Campuses Faculty Senate Meeting in the Georgetown environs would lead to costs significantly greater than if such a meeting were to be held at USC-Columbia. Therefore, the decision has been made in this Office to change the location of the Senate meeting. This will reduce travel costs and other associated expenses. It will also be necessary to cancel the planned and customary post-Senate meeting reception. Patience with and understanding of this unfortunate set of circumstances (which are entirely beyond the control of this Office) are requested.

## Attachment 3

R & R Committee  
NunneryRights & Responsibilities Committee Report:

Two motions from last meeting:

Regarding the motion for Procedures for Handling Actions of the University Campuses Faculty Senate which was passed at the September 20th meeting, some concern was expressed over the lack of a specified time frame for the initial response to a motion by the vice-president. The consensus of the committee is that the spirit of the motion implies a time frame throughout, yet allows the necessary degree of flexibility.

The only charge remaining for the committee to consider this year is to study the part-time faculty situation at each campus. The committee has prepared a list of questions (which are attached) to present to the office of Vice-President for University Campuses and Continuing Education.

R & R Committee  
Nunnery

The Rights & Responsibilities Committee is hereby requesting the following information so that we may further study issues concerning part-time faculty. We would like this information in time to present our findings at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

1. How many part-time faculty are there on each campus?
2. What percentage of courses are taught by part-time faculty on each campus?
3. What is the "normal" & maximum teaching load for part-time faculty?
4. What is the student/faculty ratio?
5. Do part-time faculty have offices on campus?
6. Do part-time faculty serve as advisors?
7. What are the criteria for selecting part-time faculty?
8. What are the credentials of current part-time faculty at each campus?
9. What is the rate of pay for part-time faculty on each campus?
10. What is the male/female ratio for part-time faculty on each campus?
11. What are these part-time faculty member's teaching loads commitments on other campuses?
12. Which campuses have unfilled full-time teaching slots open, & how many slots are open on these campuses? Of these open slots, how many are being "filled" through the use of part-time faculty?

# Attachment 4

## UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT, FEB. 21, 1986

Dr. Milton Baker spoke with the Committee about recently received 1985-1986 faculty salary reports for the University Campuses. Additional statistics (from USC Statistical Profiles and the yearly AAUP report) will be distributed to Committee members soon. Interest in obtaining more information on the budgeting of University Campuses and generating a statistical model for dealing with the salary issue was also expressed.

The Committee discussed a resolution from the University Faculty Welfare Committee regarding promotional raises. The Chair agreed to write a letter to that Committee expressing our opposition to differential treatment based on campus association and our continued support for increasing promotional awards by a specified dollar amount which would be the same for campuses throughout the System.

Committee members received an updated document on course load, overload compensation, and contact hours policies for individual University Campuses.

A special meeting on the salary issue will be held at 1:30 p.m. on April 4 in Columbia.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory J. Labyak

COURSE LOAD, OVERLOAD COMPENSATION, AND CONTACT HOURS  
POLICIES FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES, 1985-1986

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

\* a 12/12 option has been approved for 1986-87, with additional non-teaching duties normally required

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

The Union, Lancaster, and Beaufort Campuses have no written policy regarding course reductions for non-teaching responsibilities, although reduced course loads have been allowed in certain instances. At Sumter, division coordinators receive a 6 hour reduction, and student advisors are granted a 3 hour reduction or overload compensation for one course per academic year (1½ hours per semester).





## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

OFFICE OF THE SYSTEM VICE PRESIDENT  
for University Campuses and  
Continuing Education

November 21, 1985

(803) 777-7695

MEMORANDUM

TO: Professor Gregg Labyak, Chairman,  
University Campuses Faculty  
Senate Welfare Committee

FROM: John N. Gardner *JNG*  
Associate Vice President

SUBJECT: Requested Salary Information

Please consider this an initial response to your previous questions and concerns transmitted to me in your letters of April 26 and October 14, 1985, respectively. As you know I have referred these questions to the Deans for supplemental information in addition to that which I have already provided you. What follows is a listing of the questions followed the response of each campus to that particular question:

1. "Are there plans to actively study the 1985 salary data for your campus with a view toward alleviating discrepancies based on gender or campus?"

USC-Beaufort - No.

USC-Lancaster - Information not yet available.

Lifelong Learning - This unit reports that there were no salary discrepancies based on gender.

USC-Salkehatchie - The campus reviewed the 1985 salary data and concluded that it found no discrepancies based on gender. They reported that past gender discrepancies have been previously rectified.

USC-Sumter also responds in the negative. That campus reports that its previous analyses have revealed no discrepancies based on gender. It adds, however, that it will, of course, continue to monitor the situation to prevent such discrepancies from occurring.

Professor Gregg Labyak  
 November 21, 1985  
 Page 2

USC-Union - The campus reports that this subject is and has been under continuous review and that steps have been taken to correct discrepancies when discovered.

2. "Are new faculty being paid a starting salary commensurate with their experience, education level, and field of study but not (except in exceptional circumstances) more than returning faculty with the same credentials?"

USC-Beaufort - yes

USC-Lancaster - Information not yet available.

Lifelong Learning - This unit has not hired a new full-time faculty member for a number of years.

USC-Salkehatchie responded in the affirmative. It is the campus practice that prior to making offers to new faculty the academic credentials and experience are compared to comparable characteristics of continuing faculty. Appropriate salary determinations are made after such a review.

USC-Sumter - yes

USC-Union responds in the affirmative with respect to the Union campus and University Campus colleagues. It adds, however, that the answer would be in the negative, with respect to USC-Columbia counterparts.

3. "Regarding pay raises for 1985/1986, did you allocate State mandated raises for each faculty member receiving at least a satisfactory evaluation?" (What this means is did you give faculty that you rated satisfactory at least 6%?)

USC-Beaufort - No.

USC-Lancaster - Information not yet available.

Lifelong Learning - Salary increases in this unit ranged from 5-8% for full-time faculty. These raises were based on teaching and service to the Division.

USC-Salkehatchie responded in the affirmative. Every continuing full-time faculty member at USC-Salkehatchie received above a 6% salary increase. The campus used 4% as the initial base increase for satisfactory performance, yet all base and merit increases combined exceeded 6%.

Professor Gregg Labyak  
November 21, 1985  
Page 3

USC-Sumter - The campus reports that when it made its initial salary determinations, it was working with a pool of dollars representing 6%. The campus used a flat figure of \$1,000 as the base increase. \$1,000 represents 4% of 25,000 which is a little more than the average pre-raise faculty salary. These \$1,000 increases therefore used up a little more than 4% of the 6% pool, leaving 2% for distribution in merit increases. Every faculty member who was rated at least satisfactory was given an increase of \$1,000. (Therefore, Greg, my interpretation of this would be that campus did not have the money available to provide every faculty member rated as satisfactory at least 6%.

Lifelong Learning - Salary increases in this unit ranged from 5-8% for full-time faculty. These raises were based on teaching and service to the division.

USC-Union responded in the negative and explained that there was no state mandated increase. The average pay raise at USC-Union was 5.5%.

- 4. "Did you then allocate additional merit pay as appropriate?" (i.e., in addition to 6%)

USC-Beaufort responds in the affirmative.

USC-Lancaster - Information not yet available.

Lifelong Learning responded in the affirmative.

USC-Salkehatchie - All USC-Salkehatchie continuing full-time faculty received merit pay increases in addition to the 4% base. The campus merit range was 2.5% through 7% (i.e., in addition to the 4% base).

USC-Sumter - the campus reports that it allocated merit pay according to the scale described in response to question 7, i.e. as follows:

- Satisfactory - \$1000
- Between Satisfactory and Above Average - \$1,000 + \$300
- Above Average - \$1000 + \$600
- Between Above Average and Outstanding - \$1000 + \$900
- Outstanding - \$1000 + \$1200

As indicated above the money for these merit increases came from roughly 2% overall remaining after the \$1000 increments were assigned. The total of merit increases exceeded 6%.

Professor Gregg Labyak  
 November 21, 1985  
 Page 4

USC-Union's response was in the affirmative. See also USC-Union response to question number 7.

5. "Did you make bottom end adjustments where appropriate?"

USC-Beaufort - No.

USC-Lancaster - Information not yet available.

Lifelong Learning responded in the negative. Bottom end adjustments were made during the previous fiscal year.

USC-Salkehatchie - Three bottom end salary adjustments were made.

USC-Sumter responded in the affirmative. Funding for these adjustments was not taken from the 6% overall budget. Additional funds were secured by action of the Dean for these adjustments.

USC-Union responded in the affirmative. See also response to number 7.

6. "Were promotional increases awarded independently of merit raises, bottom end adjustments, etc.?"

USC-Beaufort responded in the affirmative.

USC-Lancaster - Information not yet available.

Lifelong Learning - This campus indicated that this question was not applicable to this unit.

USC-Salkehatchie responded in the affirmative.

USC-Sumter responded in the affirmative.

USC-Union responded in the affirmative.

7. "How did you define and distribute merit increases?"

USC-Beaufort - The Dean asked faculty members who wished to be considered for a merit raise to submit a list of their professional activities for 1984/85. Using this faculty input and the advice of the Academic Dean, he rated each faculty member on teaching, productive scholarship, and University service using a five point scale as follows:

Professor Gregg Labyak  
November 21, 1985  
Page 5

- 1 = unsatisfactory
- 2 = poor, needs improvement
- 3 = satisfactory
- 4 = good
- 5 = outstanding

This procedure produced three categories of ratings which were given the following raises:

| Total rating | Raise   |
|--------------|---------|
| 13           | \$1,800 |
| 12           | \$1,500 |
| 11           | \$1,100 |

USC-Lancaster - Information not yet available.

Lifelong Learning - Merit raises were given to individuals who continue to make the extra effort to help with enrollment issues; recruiting; retention; committee work; and through their actions contributing to the overall betterment of the Division.

USC-Salkehatchie - A letter was sent to all USC-Salkehatchie full-time continuing faculty members identical to the sample attached to this memorandum. This letter represented a letter of transmittal for the "terms of employment documents" sent and explained to each individual how base and merit increases were awarded and distributed.

USC-Sumter - Raises were allocated according to a scale based on each faculty member's overall rating on the State Personnel Evaluation form. Every faculty member who earned an overall rating of at least "satisfactory" received a basic merit raise of \$1,000. Further raises were given in \$300 increments as follows:

- Satisfactory - \$1000
- Between Satisfactory and Above Average - \$1,000 + \$300
- Above Average - \$1000 + 600
- Between Above Average and Outstanding - \$1000 + 900
- Outstanding - \$1000 + 1200

Greg, this procedure is a continuation and an attempted further regularization of the procedure outlined in Dean Lisk's memo dated November 12, 1984 and amended in a memo of February 26, 1985. You may request copies of these communications from him if you wish to do so.

Professor Gregg Labyak  
November 21, 1985  
Page 6

USC-Union - The campus reports that salary recommendations were based on the Dean's evaluation using input from each of the other Union Campus Deans, annual T&P file updates that were required of all faculty, 1985-85 peer evaluations, and his own observations.

In the Dean's evaluation procedure, he attempted to place faculty in one of three different performance categories, specifically:

1. performed above the standard (recommended increase between 6.5-7.5%)
2. performance equal to the standard (recommended increase between 5.0-6.0%)
3. performed below the standard (recommended increase between 3.5-4.5%).

This procedure awarded the "average faculty member" with a 5.5% increase. The additional 1.5% (difference between 5.5% and 7.0% of the pay package) and the amount left from raise recommendations less than 5.5% was used to give a "salary range adjustment" between 1-3% to individuals with salaries grossly out of line with their experience, responsibilities, or credentials.

As you know, this Office will be forwarding additional information to you as it becomes available. Thank you for your patience with our timetable for collection of salary data.

mkh

- cc: Jack Anderson  
 Pete Arnold  
 Carl Clayton  
 Ken Davis  
 John Duffy  
 John May  
 Ron Tuttle



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

OFFICE OF THE SYSTEM VICE PRESIDENT  
for University Campuses and  
Continuing Education

December 18, 1985

(803) 777-7695

Prof. Gregg Labyak  
USC-Salkehatchie  
Allendale, SC 29810

Dear Prof. ~~Labyak~~ *Gregg*:

This letter provides comparative 1984-85 salary data for the University Campuses and similar institutions. The criteria for selection of the other institutions are: two-year institutions within a "system" with enrollment closest to the University Campuses. Salaries are in thousands of dollars rounded to hundreds.

Salary data marked with an asterisk are from the University Campuses salary studies; other salaries are from the AAUP annual report of salaries for the appropriate year.

Four years' average data, nine months' equivalent for the five campuses:

|          | <u>Professor</u> | <u>Assoc. Prof.</u> | <u>Asst. Prof.</u> | <u>Instructor</u> |
|----------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1982-83  | ---              | 21.2                | 17.9               | 16.9              |
| 1983-84* | 26.2             | 22.4                | 18.9               | 16.9              |
| 1984-85* | 29.0             | 25.0                | 21.0               | 19.2              |
| 1985-86* | 30.9             | 26.5                | 23.0               | 21.0              |

Sincerely,

Milton S. Baker

MSB/dk

cc: Dr. Duffy  
Prof. Gardner  
Deans of the  
University Campuses  
Dean Bowden  
Dean May

40  
AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES (IN THOUSANDS) FOR  
SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

-----  
1984-85  
-----

| SYSTEM       | CAMPUS               | PROF. | ASSOC.<br>PROF. | ASST.<br>PROF. | INSTR. |
|--------------|----------------------|-------|-----------------|----------------|--------|
| -----        | -----                | ----- | -----           | -----          | -----  |
| U.S.C.       | Beaufort             | ( - ) | 23.4            | 20.5           | -      |
|              | Lancaster            | -     | 25.5            | 21.7           | ( - )  |
|              | Salkehatchie         | ( - ) | 24.4            | 20.1           | -      |
|              | Suater               | ( - ) | 24.7            | 21.0           | ( - )  |
|              | Union                | ( - ) | ( - )           | 19.6           | 18.1   |
|              | *Average             |       | 29.4            | 24.8           | 20.9   |
| Ohio Univ.   | Reimont              | -     | 30.7            | 26.5           | -      |
|              | Chillicothe          | -     | 27.4            | 23.1           | 21.8   |
|              | Lancaster            | -     | 28.3            | 22.2           | 21.7   |
|              | Zanesville           | ( - ) | 27.4            | 22.0           | ( - )  |
|              | *Average             | ( - ) | 28.2            | 23.5           | 21.4   |
| La. State U. | Alexandria           | 28.7  | 24.7            | 21.4           | 17.8   |
|              | Eunice               | ( - ) | 24.8            | 22.1           | 18.5   |
|              | *Average             | 28.9  | 24.7            | 21.8           | 18.2   |
| Penn State   | *Average             | 34.6  | 28.8            | 23.1           | 19.6   |
| New York     | Jamestown CC         | 32.1  | 30.1            | 20.9           | 15.6   |
|              | Fulton-Montgomery CC | 33.2  | 29.4            | 24.8           | 18.1   |
|              | North Country CC     | 32.7  | 28.1            | 23.5           | 13.5   |
|              | Sullivan Co. CC      | 31.9  | 28.2            | 21.6           | 20.0   |
|              | *Average             | 32.3  | 29.2            | 22.2           | 17.2   |
| Wisconsin    | Centers (13)         | 29.6  | 24.8            | 20.9           | 17.6   |

( - ) Dollars not shown for cells of N=3 or less.

\*Weighted

Source: "Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession,"  
AAUP Academic, March-April 1985.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research.  
CO - 12/17/85



(A) Resolution

Resolved that the administration of the University implement the following policy in regard to promotion increases:

(1) Amount of Increase:

The amount of promotion salary increase shall be an amount equal to 10% of the previous year's average University salary (for all faculty on the Columbia campus) within the rank to which the person is to be promoted.

By way of illustration: Professor Smith is to be promoted to associate professor. In the prior year the mean salary for all associate professors was \$30,000. Professor Smith would earn a \$3,000 promotion increase.

(2) No Effect on Merit Increases

Any professor who is promoted, additionally is entitled to any merit increase for the year of promotion. By virtue of the promotion, it is to be assumed that the promoted faculty member is entitled to a reasonable additional merit increase.

By way of illustration: If Professor Smith's salary before promotion were \$25,000 and she were to be awarded a 10% promotion increase of \$3,000, and she were deemed to have earned a 6% merit increase (\$1,500), her total increase would thus be \$4,500.

(3) Pre-Cleared With Budget and Control Board

The above procedure should be precleared with the Budget and Control Board. The department head should not be required to obtain specific approval of the raise unless the merit portion alone exceeded state guidelines.

(4) University-Wide Application

This promotion raise policy shall be implemented for all campuses. Provided, however, the base against which the promotion raise shall be determined for non-Columbia campus faculty shall either be the average salary for all the University Campuses, or all four year campuses, depending upon where the professor teaches.

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE  
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF  
THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the findings of the University Campuses Faculty Senate in regard to the recommendations of the Presidential Commission on Undergraduate Education. The process that sanctioned this Report involved the deliberations of the Senate's Intra-University Services and Communications Committee, the advice this Committee received from various concerned individuals and committees on each University Campus, the consultations of the Senate's Executive Committee, and the majority support of the Senate itself. The Report reflects, therefore, a broad-based constituency whose views, regarding both the importance and the desirability of the Presidential Commission's recommendations, have achieved consensus.

Concerning the importance of these recommendations, the Senate clearly endorses the central thesis of the Presidential Commission's Report, which is that the University of South Carolina System should provide broad access to quality higher education. There can, in fact, be no greater testimony to the University System's commitment to the goal of broad access than its sustained commitment to the vital well-being of the University Campuses represented by this Senate. These campuses make higher education locally available throughout the State, in many instances to people who otherwise would not go to college. It is from the fold of University Campuses that Four-Year Campuses outside Columbia have developed, and it is only through the collective effort of all campuses, including the University Campuses, that the full range of programs and benefits of the University System can achieve statewide prominence.

Quality higher education, the Presidential Commission noted, is not excluded by broad access. The Senate strongly endorses this view. The mark of its conviction is to be found in its rejection of Recommendations Six, Seven, and Eight, recommendations which clearly presuppose a concept of quality not to be distributed Systemwide. As this Report indicates, the Senate rejects these recommendations by means of affirming what is laudatory in other recommendations of the Presidential Commission.

Concerning the desirability of the recommendations, the Senate is not in agreement with all the Commission's findings. It has indicated its reservations on some recommendations, advising caution in the implementation even of some that it endorses. Yet the Commission's effort to set forth the vision of a unified system of quality public higher education, modelled on the centrality of purpose the baccalaureate degree must occupy in any academic community, has earned the respect and the appreciation of the Senate.

## RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

**RECOMMENDATION ONE.** The undergraduate education mission of the University of South Carolina System is to provide the people of South Carolina broad access to quality higher education.

Response. The Senate endorses the recommendation that the University of South Carolina continue to provide broad access to quality education. We feel that this recommendation represents the heart of the mission of the University System.

**RECOMMENDATION TWO.** In addition to broad access to quality higher education, each of the nine campuses of the University of South Carolina System should provide leadership in the enhancement of the quality of life and the improvement of social institutions in the community it serves.

Response. We accept this recommendation as an endorsement of present practices.

**RECOMMENDATION THREE.** Certain general education requirements should be common to all undergraduate programs and the appropriate faculties should ensure their inclusion in all System baccalaureate programs. Included in these are: English; Numerical and Analytical Reasoning; Natural Sciences; and Humanities and Social Sciences.

Response. We agree and believe that these general education requirements will strengthen the academic backgrounds of students enrolled and will allow them to move to other courses with confidence and competence.

**RECOMMENDATION FOUR.** All baccalaureate programs within the University System should include as a minimum:

1. English - 6 credits at the level of English 101 and 102 or above.
2. Numerical and Analytical Reasoning - 3 credits of mathematics at the level of MATH 121 or above, and 3 additional credits of computer science, logic or statistics.
3. Humanities and Social Sciences - 6 credits - 3 of which should be in history.
4. Natural Sciences - 6 credits, at least one course of which must include a lab requirement.

Response. Recommendation Four formulates certain minimum requirements for baccalaureate programs. Inasmuch as the University System is evolving as a system of autonomous campuses, flexibility must be allowed in determining the specific courses to be included under each heading so that undergraduate programs at different campuses can meet the needs of the varieties of students and majors represented on those campuses.

RECOMMENDATION FIVE. Each appropriate college, department or campus should set progression requirements for admission to upper-level status in its program. Such progression requirements should insure that competency in the general education requirements has been achieved, either by requiring a minimum grade point average in those courses or through a general comprehensive progression examination. The majority of the general education requirements should be completed before admission to upper-level status.

Response. The Senate agrees that progression requirements are important but observes that their introduction into a curriculum that has not developed in this manner, such as the University's, will involve fundamental changes. For example, the term "upper-level" currently has very different meanings in different colleges and on different campuses throughout the System.

RECOMMENDATION SIX. A principal mission of the University Campuses is to provide the first two years of undergraduate education. These Campuses, under the supervision and control of a four-year University of South Carolina Campus, may offer upper-level courses leading to the Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies (B.A.I.S.) degree. Upper-level baccalaureate courses, other than those applicable to the B.A.I.S., and baccalaureate degree programs should be offered only on four-year campuses.

Response. See below.

RECOMMENDATION SEVEN. The University System should maintain its commitment to meet regional needs for baccalaureate education by offering an appropriate range of degree programs on each of its four-year campuses.

Response. See below.

RECOMMENDATION EIGHT. The University System should meet the broad needs for baccalaureate education in all academic areas demanded by an increasingly complex and technical world by offering a full range of undergraduate degree programs on the Columbia campus.

Response. The Senate rejects the three-tiered system implicit in Recommendations Six, Seven, and Eight.

The Senate feels that Recommendation Six of the Commission report could cause the University Campuses major problems if interpreted in a restrictive manner. We feel that this recommendation merits much further discussion by the University to insure that the University of South Carolina as a whole will be advancing toward the goal of statewide excellence in undergraduate education. Certain interpretations of this recommendation will impede any advance toward excellence in undergraduate education on the University Campuses.

If indeed the purpose of the University Campuses is to provide broad access to quality education and leadership in the enhancement of the quality of life and improvement of the social institutions served (Recommendation Two) and if the unique qualities of the University Nine-Campus System should be recognized and the sense of pride should be strengthened (Recommendation Nine), a recommendation which proposes restrictions on the University Campuses is in conflict with the spirit of the Commission's report. Decisions regarding the evolution of campuses and programs should involve an assessment of the impact on the community, the individual unit, and the System as a whole to ensure the provision of high quality undergraduate education (Recommendation Twenty). From our perspective these three recommendations are more appropriate to the tenor of the Commission's report than Recommendation Six. They, and not Recommendation Six, should be accepted.

Adoption of the recommendation would mean the elimination of important programs at some campuses. Further, by use of the BAIS, all campuses would be constrained to adopt arbitrary justification procedures for the 300 and 400 level courses they do offer, rather than offer upper-level courses based on the strengths of their academic programs. These are, in the estimation of the campuses involved, sound academic programs and important both to the individual campuses and to their communities. To eliminate these quality programs and prevent carefully-planned future offerings would do a disservice to the citizens served by our campuses and, as a result, to the State as a whole. It would also invite or even force certain contracting agents, such as the U.S. military, and private colleges to take the initiative and establish competing academic programs that may be inferior to those of the University.

The University Campuses are clearly dedicated to teaching excellence and as teachers interested in excellence, we must not be denied the opportunity to teach courses in our specialties. Indeed, such denial would hinder the University Campuses' ability to hire and retain quality faculty.

Finally, the Committee wishes to stress that the campuses are responding to needs expressed by their constituencies. None of these higher-level course offerings is being forced on an unwilling public. Rather, in most cases the public is demanding that these campuses expand their offerings even further, since many of our students find it very difficult to commute long distances for extended periods of time to earn their baccalaureate degrees. Many governmental officials feel that having a flexible, expanding university in their communities will help attract more business to their towns and help them diversify their economic bases. Indeed, interviews with businesses considering locations for future expansion list the availability of quality higher education as one of the important factors in deciding where to move.

Therefore, we ask that Recommendations Six, Seven, and Eight be rejected.

**RECOMMENDATION NINE.** The unique qualities of the University Nine-Campus System should be recognized and the sense of pride in all units of the System should be strengthened.

Response. The Senate accepts the spirit of Recommendation Nine but wishes to point out that a "spirit of pride" need not be tied to the three-tiered system as conceived in Recommendations Six, Seven, and Eight.

**RECOMMENDATION TEN.** Communication and interchange among the faculties on the nine campuses should be encouraged and funds allocated for more Systemwide meetings of faculties within the same discipline.

Response. The Senate supports this recommendation and encourages the University System to fund such interchange.

**RECOMMENDATION ELEVEN.** Each unit within the University System should maintain direct communications with other units, particularly regarding course requirements, course and curriculum changes, changes in prerequisites, and course renumbering.

Response. The Senate has long been aware of communication problems among the nine campuses. From the University Campus perspective we have had students who have had difficulties with the acceptance of course credits. We have had students distressed by differing programs and course requirements at the Four-Year Campuses.

With the growth of the University Campuses and the Four-Year Campuses other than Columbia, nearly half of the University's undergraduates do not go to Columbia. Aiken, Spartanburg, and Coastal have grown large enough to offer many programs that students moving from a University Campus find attractive. On some University Campuses more students move to the new Four-Year Campuses than to Columbia. Yet our Campuses have inadequate faculty links with the Four-Year Campuses.

The Senate would like to propose for faculty consideration a new faculty body with representatives from all System Campuses. Its mission would be to strengthen the efforts of all faculty senates in the System to develop and preserve the quality of their respective academic programs. The Senate hesitates to propose yet another body but feels that the potential benefits to smooth functioning of the System would far outweigh the disadvantages of another faculty body. We believe that this proposal is very much in keeping with the spirit of Recommendation Eleven. We also believe that this proposal should be given very careful consideration in light of the directions that all of the campuses have taken.

RECOMMENDATION TWELVE. The University of South Carolina should continue to seek minorities and women as faculty and administrators.

Response. The Senate supports this recommendation but we feel that the University should not only "seek" but also "hire" minorities and women as faculty and administrators.

RECOMMENDATION THIRTEEN. Requests to the System campuses for courses at off-campus locations should be subject to review and recommendation of the appropriate campus faculty.

Response. There have been major population shifts since the University Campuses began as well as tremendous changes in the demands for services placed on University Campuses. The request for services in Laurens, Walterboro, and Hilton Head in particular demonstrates these changes. University Campuses must have the flexibility to respond to the needs of communities in their service areas. To assume that our only measures of quality and progress have been new buildings and enrollment figures is a narrow view. Our focus must be on the content and quality of education as we make changes. Our goal is to make the undergraduate experience more meaningful and available on each of our campuses. We agree that there is a lot of planning to be implemented to assure that students on the off-campus locations have this experience. All campuses feel committed to broaden full-time faculty participation and to provide a level of quality comparable to on-campus locations.

We, therefore, agree that it is appropriate for individual University Campus faculty to review and recommend requests for all courses they offer, wherever these courses are taught.

RECOMMENDATION FOURTEEN. The importance of strong teaching and advisement in the first two undergraduate years should be reaffirmed and the President should consider additional means in these areas to ensure that faculty performance receives appropriate recognition and rewards.

Response. The Senate agrees with this recommendation. Strong teaching and advisement are important and should be recognized throughout the entire undergraduate experience.

RECOMMENDATION FIFTEEN. The support and development of the System faculty should be furthered through special attention to adequate provision for sabbaticals, release time and the opportunity for research and scholarship. The scope of the faculty exchange program should be broadened.

Response. The Senate concurs with the intent of Recommendation Fifteen to improve faculty development opportunities Systemwide, particularly in conjunction with the assertion that "...additional resources must be made available to provide support for sabbatical leaves and reduced teaching loads to assist in the professional development of the faculty" (p. 95).

Recommendation Fifteen also recommends that the scope of the Faculty Exchange Program be broadened to recruit faculty members with highly specialized areas of expertise. With this concept the Senate has no objection, and indeed concurs with it, but wishes to emphasize that adequate funding must be provided.

**RECOMMENDATION SIXTEEN.** This Commission endorses the spirit of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education's standards for college-bound students; however, it urges the campuses to continue offering appropriate access to higher education for students who have not yet met such mandated standards.

Response. Recommendation Sixteen is a qualified endorsement of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education's standards for college-bound students, standards that are due to go into effect by 1988. The Senate heartily concurs with the endorsement proper.

The qualification to the endorsement concerns the Commission's commitment to the concept of broad access (Recommendation One), which could be jeopardized by a rigorous application of these standards. The argument of the text of the Report is based principally on the concerns for first-generation college students and on the maintenance of a representational "mix" of qualified students. The Senate therefore understands that the intent of this qualification is not to deny the need to upgrade the standards of incoming Freshmen and is instead based on humanitarian concerns and on the University's commitment to its public. With this assurance the Senate heartily concurs with the qualification as well as with the endorsement proper.

**RECOMMENDATION SEVENTEEN.** Detailed studies should be made of the full range of academic and co-curricular factors influencing the undergraduate student experience. These studies should be ongoing, to provide current and sound databases for future decisions.

Response. Recommendation Seventeen recommends detailed, ongoing studies of academic and co-curricular factors influencing the undergraduate student experience. This recommendation is supported by an extensive discussion in the Report concerning the needs and the benefits of such studies, with particular consideration given to the role of University 101. The Senate agrees with the importance of such studies and therefore concurs with the Recommendation. However, few University Campuses at present have the capability or the resources to carry out such studies and therefore will require an expansion in their administrative services to conduct such studies effectively. Furthermore, the Senate assumes that the primary purpose of such studies will be to enhance the planning and the decision-making abilities of each campus locally, resulting secondarily in an improvement in the quality of information disseminated for Systemwide review and decision-making.



RECOMMENDATION EIGHTEEN. Because quality undergraduate education requires adequate library and specialized teaching facilities, special attention should be given to campuses on which these facilities have not kept pace with growing enrollments and course offerings.

Response. The Senate construes "facilities" as it occurs in this recommendation to include resources more broadly and not just physical facilities. Given that qualification, we concur with the Commission's concern for improved instructional facilities where needed, including laboratory equipment and instructional aids.

In particular, we endorse the Commission's emphasis on libraries in stating this recommendation. We welcome special attention to the University Campus libraries' ability to collect and provide access to knowledge in support of the academic program. In addition to an emphasis on collections and staffing, we encourage attention to the implementation of a System online catalog for access to the University's library holdings. The capability to determine ownership, location, and availability of a book, using a computer terminal on campus or at home, is now available to users of the Clemson University Library. The South Carolina State Library presently is installing such a system in its headquarters in Columbia and has specific plans for making its collection and all public library holdings available to public library users statewide. We encourage adoption of a Systemwide online catalog. We also must emphasize the importance of the Library Processing Centers' Retrospective Conversion Project, which will convert University and Four-Year Campus library holdings into machine readable form for use in a System online catalog. For full System participation in and use of an online catalog, this project must be completed expeditiously. Furthermore, the University online catalog ultimately should be linked to all other online catalogs in the State.

RECOMMENDATION NINETEEN. The funding formula of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education should be amended to provide continuing allocations for computer resources to keep pace with the increasing needs of undergraduate students for access to computer technology.

Response. We concur with this recommendation. The emerging and continuing importance of computer usage in higher education and in our society should be recognized in the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education's funding formula. The Senate notes that allocations for computer resources is only one of several areas in which funding by formula has severe limitations.

RECOMMENDATION TWENTY. Decisions regarding the evolution of campuses and programs should involve an assessment of the impact on the community, the individual unit, and the System as a whole to ensure the provision of high quality undergraduate education.

Response. The Senate concurs with the spirit of Recommendation Twenty to ensure that the campuses evolve in response to needs that are more basic than mere increases in numbers. It has serious reservations about the decision-making procedures alluded to in the recommendation proper. Specifically, the Senate cautions that System priorities should not eclipse individual campus development, just as individual campus development is not isolated from community needs.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Senate agrees wholeheartedly with the mission of the University System as formulated in Recommendation One and with what it recognizes as a description of University Campus practices in Recommendation Two. Statements of mission, however, do not imply uniform content, and disagreement has surfaced over certain other recommendations. This disagreement is strongest concerning Recommendations Six, Seven, and Eight, all three of which the Senate rejects. It is the judgement of the Senate that the University's missions can be implemented without these recommendations and further, that the vision of the Commission cannot be implemented if these recommendations are followed. Other recommendations speak to the quality of the educational program, improvements in communication, faculty development, libraries and specialized resources, and institutional research throughout the System. With these recommendations the Senate is in agreement either in principle or in fact, and where it has reservations it has so indicated.

In two instances the Senate has made recommendations beyond the Commission's own recommendations. In its response to Recommendation Eighteen it has recommended the adoption of a Systemwide on-line catalog and has called for the expeditious completion of the Library Processing Center's Retrospective Conversion Project. In response to Recommendation Eleven, furthermore, it has recommended the creation of a new faculty body with representatives from all nine campuses, for the purpose of strengthening the efforts of all faculty senates to develop and preserve the quality of their respective academic programs. The Senate urges that these initiatives be given serious consideration throughout the System.

On this day, February 21, 1986, with the passage by majority vote of this Report and its contents, the University Campuses Faculty Senate makes known its position regarding the recommendations of the Presidential Commission on Undergraduate Education.

## RESOLUTION

The Senate believes that the administrative withholding of promotion files at the Union Campus, contrary to longstanding promotion procedures, is a violation of the rights of the faculty members concerned, who, in good faith, applied for promotion through practices which are traditional on the University Campuses Systems, and which have been followed this year on other University Campuses.

## II

The University Campuses Faculty Senate recognizes that the existing system of funding does not always adequately meet the needs of the University Campuses and often places severe restrictions on the ability of their respective administrations to meet the demands of their missions. The Senate believes, however, that these strictures should not be combatted by violating those faculty prerogatives now in practice and denying legitimate expectations generated by existing precedent; therefore, the Senate recommends:

1. That those persons already employed as instructors on the University Campuses retain the benefits of the existing system of promotion, including review of promotion applications through normal faculty channels; and,
  
2. That persons hired at the rank of instructor on the University Campuses in the future be clearly informed that promotion to the tenure track is exclusively an administrative prerogative, and that appointment to the rank of instructor carries no presumption of any kind of tenure nor of any future promotion.

Substitute motion  
from Haist

Attachment 8

2-21-86

The University Campuses Faculty Senate is aware that the existing system of funding does not work adequately to meet the needs of the University Campuses and often places severe restrictions on the ability of their Deans to meet the demands of their missions. Nonetheless the Senate believes that these challenges should not be met at the expense of traditional principles and practices of faculty governance and autonomy. The Senate views with grave concern the administration's decision to begin to exercise unilaterally that authority relating to promotion which is now being exercised in concert with the faculty, and calls upon the administration to continue the present practice of processing promotions to the tenure track through normal faculty channels.



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA AT UNION

P. O. Drawer 729  
UNION, SOUTH CAROLINA 29379

MEMO

FORM: A. D. Charles, Chair, Union Campus  
Faculty Organization

TO: University Campus Faculty Senate

VIA: Tandy Willis, Senate Secretary

SUBJECT: Status and salaries of adjunct  
teaching faculty

Whereas, there is a tendency to avoid hiring new full-time, tenure-track faculty while retaining increasing numbers of part-time people, and

Whereas, these part-time faculty receive low and fixed salaries not subject either to promotional, merit, or cost-of-living increases, they cannot be expected to:

- a) hold office hours
- b) serve on committees
- c) participate in university functions or campus events of any kind, and

Whereas, while the percentage of the total teaching load handled by part-time personnel increases, it puts an additional burden of committee work and extra-curricula functions onto the full-time faculty, the following recommendations are respectfully submitted:

It is recommended that adjunct faculty be placed on a ranking scale based on their qualifications and length of service with sizeable increments distinguishing people with many years part-time service from those teaching on the adjunct level for the first time. Merit raise possibilities should also be included.

It is recommended that campuses retaining the part-time services of a single individual for two or three courses consider non-tenure-track but full-time slots for such persons in case regular, full-time slots are deemed budgetarily difficult.

It is further recommended that, as the members of the University Campus Faculty Senate are personally well acquainted with the problem, that the Senate pass a resolution urging the system Vice-President for University Campuses to inquire into this situation and report back to this body.

Respectfully submitted,

*Allan D. Charles*

Allan D. Charles, Ph.D.  
Professor

fb

2-21-86



# INTRA-OFFICE MEMO

Date: February 21, 1986

To: Professor Rod Sproatt Campus: Beaufort

From: Laura M. Zaidman Campus: Sumter

Subject: Report from Special Committees--Research Advisory Committee

The attached copies of minutes from the Research Advisory Committee meetings and the information on the Fund for Excellence in Research reflect some of the recent matters discussed by this committee, to which I was appointed by Dr. Duffy to serve as the one representative for the University Campuses.

The primary concerns of the committee lie in obtaining more research and development money for the Columbia campus; in fact, a rough draft of a brochure describing research projects at USC does not mention the University Campuses at all--a problem I have discussed with the writer from SPAR. I would be happy to pass along to any of you information about topics relevant to your campus. You might be interested in promoting the Fund for Excellence in Research--President Holderman's proposal to the state legislature to match each research dollar (from non-state funding) with fifty cents for five years.

If you would provide me with information about research grants your campus has received, I will collate this material and circulate it at the next Senate meeting.





UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

OFFICE OF SPONSORED PROGRAMS  
AND RESEARCH

(803) 777-7093

December 9, 1985

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Research Advisory Committee

From: Gloria Murphy *Gloria*

For those of you who were unable to attend the RAC meeting this morning, I have attached the latest draft of the upcoming brochure compiled and edited by Bud Lewandowski of the SPAR office.

Any inclusions, exclusions, comments (negative in particular) should be noted on this draft and returned to Bud within the week. Content is the primary concern at this point, not format.

Vice Presidents Borkowski and Vlahoplus attended the meeting. Dr. Borkowski emphasized the importance of the University having such a brochure and a meeting with Mr. Vlahoplus' staff at Information Services has been scheduled for next week to begin the layout and work will begin on the final draft for printing.

Ardis Savory reported on the NIH change of deadline dates, information which you should have already received from SPAR. If there are any questions, please contact your specialist in SPAR. She also noted that the November monthly report from SPAR will show a 15% downturn for proposal submissions, though the dollar volume in on the increase.

Michael Daniels, Director of Federal Relations in Washington, was in town for the meeting and reminded the committee that he is available twenty-four hours a day when needed. He spoke on the necessity of building solid research linkages with private corporations as well as the federal agencies. For those who may not have his number - (202) 533-1678.

RAC Committee  
December 9, 1985  
Page Two

Ken Humphries, Chairman of the SDI research sub-committee, submitted that committee's statement which is attached. He reminded RAC that his committee was not charged to deal with the moral issue - only with a statement for publication.

Dr. Kuhlman touched on the inter-state cooperative ventures for possible funding from EPSCOR. He and Ardis will go with a USC team to MUSC on Wednesday for further discussion. We shall keep the committee posted on developments. Please keep us informed of any inter-institutional (MUSC, Clemson, etc.) ventures.

Once again, if you were not here this morning and have not already done so, please RSVP to Laura Marlow at 7-2983 your plans for the Christmas Reception on Wednesday, December 18, at the Faculty House.

gm  
Enclosures



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

OFFICE OF SPONSORED PROGRAMS  
AND RESEARCH

(803) 777-7093

January 29, 1986

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Research Advisory Committee

From: James A. Kuhlman *JK*  
Vice President for Research

Subject: Minutes and Action Items

Present: Stan Fowler, Ken Humphries, B. A. Daetwyler, Lucia Rawls,  
James Kuhlman, Don Marchand, Randy Martin, Sallie Buice, Bruce  
Rippeteau, Jim Morris, Ardis Savory, William Schmidt, John Vernberg,  
Norm Watabe, and Doug Darwin

Representatives of Toyo Soda USA, Inc. will be visiting the South Carolina Research Authority on February 13-14 to view sites in the research park. They have requested a tour with our Chemistry Department and arrangements have been made with SCRA and Chemistry for a visit from 4-6 pm on February 13. Drs. Watabe and Sakakibara, along with a representative from SPAR, will accompany them on the tour. If you have any particular interest in meeting with this group, please contact my office. Their main interest, however, is in Chemistry.

USC will host two meetings of the SCRA, the first of which is to be March 12. Dr. Roger Miller, Director of the Technology and Management Program at the University of Quebec at Montreal, will be the speaker at a luncheon meeting March 12 at noon in the Campus Room at Capstone. Together with the SCRA Board and representatives from Clemson and MUSC, I hope that all of you will be able to attend this meeting. Please RSVP to my office as soon as possible. Please also mark June 18 on your calendar. These sessions are seen as crucial to a growing relationship between the SCRA, industry and the university research community.

Members of Research Advisory Committee  
January 29, 1986  
Page Two

Attached is a memorandum from Bud Lewandowski concerning the title of the research brochure. Any last minute "votes" should be directed to Bud.

I remind you that the 2% cut is to be at the local level - in the hands of the deans. There will be no cut in research funds or our existing support system and current arrangements. Your assistance in underlining the significance of the cuts to our research and South Carolina's growth in your writings and speeches would be helpful, however.

A subcommittee will be formed, with ex officio participation of Wilbur Smith, to design operational indicators and external relations/university linkages. I will be in touch with you for appointment to that subcommittee.

Stan Fowler reiterated the concern of the Medical School as to the problem of lack of permanent slots available for technicians, etc. on large grants. B. A. Daetwyler concurred, stating that ESRI was also having problems in this area. It was stressed that SPAR was advising the administration and pressing for appeal on that issue with State Budget and Personnel authorities.

As some of you may have heard, I have resigned from the position of System Vice President for Research effective July 1, 1986. I should be happy to discuss details with you on an individual basis. All of you are encouraged to share your thoughts on transition and the future of this office with the Provost.

I look forward to seeing you on March 12.

JK/gm

*What the*  
**FUND FOR EXCELLENCE**  
*IN RESEARCH*  
*means to*  
**SOUTH CAROLINA**

---



The University of South Carolina

□ Other research projects are involved in such areas as the professional development of science and math teachers in our middle and high schools; fostering an entire new industry, aquaculture; genetic counseling and testing; heart disease; speech and hearing disorders; child development; more efficient government; machine intelligence and computer mapping, to name only a few.

□ While a primary consideration in the development of South Carolina's research capabilities is with a view to the long-term, people in the state's sunset industries who are laid off need to be retrained and retooled soon for new industries that will move into the void created by the decline of traditional economic sectors. The state's educational community will play a valuable role in this job.

#### Why We Need To Act Now

□ In the U.S. today, the competition for high tech industries of all types is fierce. Many states are already actively engaged in targeting specific high tech industries and in developing marketing campaigns to "bring them home."

□ It's apparent to many in the State Development Board, the S.C. Chamber of Commerce, the S.C. Coordinating Council for Economic Development, and at USC, that South Carolina's economic profile as a state must be broadened as well as deepened beyond simple "smoke stack chasing."

□ USC's own record \$26.5 million in research awards still falls short of national leaders such as Johns Hopkins, Michigan, and MIT, and even behind some regional competitors in Georgia, Florida, and North Carolina.

□ The responses of other states to such similar shortcomings are instructive: in Arkansas, the governor has linked higher education to economic development by pressing for the use of incentive grants to colleges and universities; in Michigan, the state's 15 public four-year colleges are starting new economic development programs with \$25 million in state funds; in Ohio, state political and education leaders plan to discuss the role of colleges and universities in economic development.

□ Beyond the statewide view, an investment in South Carolina's research capabilities will contribute to the strength of the U.S. economy as a whole as it continues to compete in world markets.

#### Food For Thought

Some will say that a state that continually ranks near the bottom in terms of per capita income cannot afford such an ambitious plan. For others, the reality of the situation will be that South Carolina can ill afford *not* to support this proposal.

You get what you pay for.

The old saying has stood the test of time, even in times when economic competition has been so intense that no one could be blamed for losing equilibrium or developing a sense of disorientation.

The fact is, nowadays the adage has never been truer than when it was first coined. Somehow, good value has never gone out of style or lost its appeal, even in a world where the only constant is change itself.

It's a concept worth considering as South Carolina looks ahead to the beginning of the 21st century and thinks about how it is going to meet the challenges of tomorrow. The planning process is one that needs to be addressed today, for the Palmetto State's neighbors to the south, west and north — not to mention other parts of the country — are already on their way.

That's the underlying reason for University of South Carolina President James B. Holderman's proposal for the development of a 2001 Plan for the University — a comprehensive planning document formulated for all of the University's campuses that will serve as USC's blueprint for growth and development through the first year of the 21st century.

At the core of the plan is President Holderman's proposal for the creation of a Fund for Excellence in Research as an investment that will give Carolina the necessary base it needs to serve the state and its economic development for the year 2001 and beyond.

### **What The Fund Would Be**

□ A request to the state for a period of five years, to match each dollar USC and other research universities collect in non-state funded research and other sponsored programs with 50 cents.

□ For USC, the match translates into \$12 million-plus in 1985-86, if based on 1984-85 non-state funded research program dollars attracted by the University.

□ The proposal has an annual ceiling of \$20 million on the state's match for USC, which would require the University to generate \$40 million in sponsored programs and research to reach the full impact of the request.

### **How It Would Be Used**

□ The money would not be used for general operations, but would be dedicated to the purchase of equipment for the University's laboratories, the acquisition of advanced computer technology and the addition of needed resources in libraries — all necessary to boost R&D activity.

□ This is not a request for more hardware, but a bold, multi-faceted proposal that has far-reaching implications for the quality of instruction at Carolina, the role it can play in the state's economic development and the level of service it can offer its citizens.

### **How The University Would Benefit**

□ First and foremost, the match provides the resources that would enable USC to establish the kind of research infrastructure that is a prerequisite to excellence.

□ One component of this would be the purchase of highly sophisticated and expensive equipment that cannot be bought with funds from the University's normal operating budget.

□ Outstanding faculty members are drawn to the opportunity for hands-on work with more sophisticated, state-of-the-art equipment. With superior equipment and other resources, the University's faculty would be more competitive and in a much better position to attract grants for which they might otherwise not be considered.

□ Beyond superior faculty members, first-class resources also attract the better graduate students and new young faculty members, who in turn attract outstanding undergraduates.

□ This proposal goes beyond the simple purchase of new equipment. It would also provide the kind of research environment at USC that would allow such endeavors as graduate students working on research projects, even if outside grant money ~~wasn't~~ <sup>wouldn't</sup> available for the work. This kind of environment at a university helps develop a level of research expertise that provides a powerful incentive for new industries to locate in South Carolina.

### The Impact On The State's Economic Development

□ As South Carolina approaches the 21st century, there is increased importance in making a distinction between mere economic *growth* — more jobs — and economic *development* — more *productive* jobs in which people work smarter, faster, and more efficiently, thus adding more *value* to their labor. High technology is a route to this kind of economic development.

□ There has been a tendency to equate high technology with firms producing computers and semiconductors, but high tech also is being utilized in a wide array of advanced technology industries, among them, textiles, health care, communications, pharmaceuticals, publishing and scientific instruments.

□ By funding the proposal for excellence in research, the state Legislature would be sending a clear signal that South Carolina is ready to provide a first-class research capability that would be a significant factor in attracting these kinds of new high tech businesses and industries that it wants and needs.

□ Beyond the long-term benefits to the state, the reinvestment of these tax dollars in higher education's research component would have a noticeable short-term impact, both in the amount of economic activity they would generate, and in the amount of additional outside grant money that would flow into South Carolina as a result of the ability to provide matching funds.

□ With the new industries that would come to South Carolina as a result of enhanced R&D capabilities would be the kind of job opportunities that graduates will want if they're to stay in South Carolina after graduation. This process is cyclical and is self-perpetuating.

□ James M. Howell, an economist and senior vice president at the First National Bank of Boston, recently told the Security Analyst Association of Japan about how New England turned its economy around from being an aging, industrial giant that could no longer compete, to a thriving innovative area that draws high tech companies "like a magnet." Howell pointed to a variety of resources to produce this technological growth, but he noted that "*the glue that holds this together is the presence of preeminent educational institutions.*"

### The Payoff For South Carolina

□ There's more than just economic development at stake in the proposal to create a Fund for Excellence in Research.

□ Whether it's a new program to upgrade the expertise of the state's pharmacists, or studies on how the state's textile and timber industries can become more competitive world-wide, USC research translates into improved quality of life for South Carolinians. Funding for research benefits South Carolinians throughout the state in terms of quality education, jobs, and improved state services and programs.

□ With the availability of more research dollars, Carolina can expand and broaden its already impressive level of service to the state in areas that touch every segment of society.

□ Carolina research activities range from such projects as the development of "artificial intelligence" computer programs which capture knowledge and problem-solving expertise for Blue Cross and Blue Shield to help that company in processing Medicare claims, to a teen-age pregnancy risk reduction program developed by University health researchers that *cut in half* the annual number of births by teens in Bamberg County.