UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

NOVEMBER 13, 1987

USC-Union

Informal Session

Chairman Tandy Willis opened the morning session by welcoming the members and presenting the morning's speaker, retired Dean of USC-Union, now Commissioner on Higher Education, William J. Whitener. Commissioner Whitener expressed his pleasure to be with the Senate again and shared with the group the events and circumstances that enticed him from a leisurely retirement to his current position as a member of the Commission on Higher Education (CHE). Stating that Commissioners are appointed from across the state and must make decisions concerning higher education based on advantages to the entire state, he urged the campuses to invite Commissioners, particularly those representing the congressional district in which each campus lies, to visit the campuses to see first-hand the work that is accomplished as well as the campus needs. The Commissioner then provided the names and congressional districts of the Commissioners on Higher Education and the campuses contained in those districts:

First Congressional District: USC-Beaufort

Commissioner Marvin C. Jones
Commissioner Vernon McGuire
Commissioner Robert L. Utsey, Jr.

Second Congressional District:

Commissioner Walter E. Brooker
Commissioner Alba M. Lewis
(vacancy)

Third Congressional District: USC-Salkehatchie

Commissioner George L. Brightharp
Commissioner Nelle H. Taylor
Commissioner Joseph J. Turner, Jr.

Fourth Congressional District: USC-Union

Commissioner Tom Moore Craig
Commissioner William J. Whitener
Commissioner Robert S. Williams

Fifth Congressional District: USC-Lancaster and USC-Sumter

Commissioner Palmer Freeman, Sr.
Commissioner Roger E. Henderson
Commissioner Mildred R. Williams

Sixth Congressional District

Commissioner D. Glenburn Askins, Jr.
Commissioner Willa J. DeWitt
Commissioner Reba A. Kinon

The Commissioner proceeded to explain what CHE does and how CHE works. The Commission on Higher Education is a coordinating not a governing body. CHE makes decisions on academic affairs, budgets, and facilities. In addition, CHE controls desegregation money and works with the legislature in the interest of higher education. Commissioner Whitener stated that, despite rumors to the contrary, no state campuses, medical schools, or engineering schools will be closed. He added that there is a legislative motion to take the College of Charleston out of the state's College Board of Trustees; however, the Commission has not taken a position on that issue.

The Commission accomplishes its work through committees. There is a staff mandated to do the work assigned by the Commission. The staff members then present their findings to the appropriate committees of the CHE. (The Commission on Higher Education meets on the first Thursday of each month.)

Higher Education is expensive: 581 million dollars is needed for full formula funding, and 141 million dollars is needed for capital improvements. The "Cutting Edge," a proposal for the future of higher education in the state, recently released by CHE, carries a 94 million dollar price tag. If funded, higher education will experience great improvement. The proposal includes suggestions on how funding can be accomplished by correcting inequities in existing tax collection.

Commissioner Whitener ended his remarks optimistic about the future of South Carolina's higher education system.

The Commissioner then responded to questions from the floor. Professor Powers (Sumter) remarked that the Commission on Higher Education seems to be denying higher education to more students by focusing on admissions instead of graduation standards. As a result, equity may be less attainable.

Commissioner Whitener replied that the Commission wants to raise admission standards believing that high school students will be better qualified as a result of the Education Improvement Act. But standards are to be raised without changing enrollment trends. Faculties will still determine standards.

Dean Davis (Union) stated that rumors of possible mergers with technical schools are a troubling concern.

The Commissioner admitted that there is sentiment that some schools should be merged into community colleges, but that has not been a burning issue on the Commission. The Commissioner does not foresee a three-tier system of higher education in South Carolina's future. He noted, also, that Mr. Sheheen, Executive Director of CHE, does not vote.

Dean May (Lifelong Learning) asked if there is move toward the Commission becoming a governing body.

The Commissioner's reply was that there is a move to strengthen the Commission.

Professor Labyak (Salkehatchie) asked about the Commission's sentiments regarding formal approval of the University's operations at Camden, Laurens, Walterboro, and Hilton Head.

Commissioner Whitener answered that procedures have not been followed to gain approval. Additional programs and buildings increase the higher education budget. He suggested that when procedures are not followed, feelings may be hurt.

Professor Costello (Sumter) wondered if there were problems with meeting the goals of the Commission through four-year campuses.

The Commissioner responded that there will be no more four-year colleges in the state. However, there are no problems with existing practices. He suggested that new programs be taken to the Commission early for approval.

Professor Powers asked why the Sumter library is in trouble when it is needed for reaccreditation, but other projects, less crucial, are upgraded.

Commissioner Whitener replied that there has been a misunderstanding, but campuses should continue to ask for their needs.

Professor Johnson (Sumter) expressed bewilderment that a misunderstanding occurred, particularly when the campus personnel involved acted appropriately and worked with a CHE staff member.

Professor Willis (Union) asked the Commissioner to react to the developmental education and admissions issues addressed in the "Cutting Edge."

The Commissioner stated that there will be limited remedial education at the university level, more at a baccalaureate level, and even more at the University Campuses level. Technical schools will not take over the remedial education needs of higher education.

Dean May (Lifelong Learning) asked if CHE makes a distinction between remedial and developmental education. The reply was that CHE does not make such a distinction.

Professor Powers (Sumter) noted that CHE seems to feel that the Education Improvement Act will solve most standards and admissions problems. EIA, however, will not affect all of our constituents, particularly out-of-state and returning students. Is the Commission aware of the diversity of the students on our campuses?

The Commissioner did not feel that awareness was great but stated that campuses will determine admission standards which will provide for exceptional situations.

Professor McMillan (Salkehatchie) noted that EIA does not affect dyslexic kinds of students.

Professor Johnson (Sumter) wondered how best to affect the CHE agenda.

Commissioner Whitener advised that the best strategy is to work with the CHE staff members. The Commission votes 90% of the time based on recommendations from the staff. He predicted, and voiced his favor, that CHE will be strengthened because the legislature is overloaded.

Reflecting on memorable associations with the University, University Campuses in particular, Commissioner Whitener left the group with best wishes for future success.

Dean's remarks were postponed until the afternoon session. The Senate adjourned to Standing Committee meetings.

GENERAL SESSION

Chairman Willis opened the afternoon session by welcoming the Senate delegation. He recognized and congratulated Professor Allan Charles (Union) for his recently published book, The Narrative History of Union County, South Carolina. The Chair then asked for Deans' remarks.

Dean Davis (Union) welcomed the Senate and acknowledged Senate Chairman Willis, Professors Betty Martin and Charles Walker, and the Special Activities Committee for the day's arrangements and activities, particularly the reception at Rose Hill State Park.

Dean Arnold (Lancaster) reported that Lancaster has had a good beginning this semester. Renovations on Hubbard Hall will begin soon. He thanked Commissioner Jack Whitener and the Commission on Higher Education for giving other needed work high priority in the Facilities Planning Report. He announced the funding of a Title III proposal which will enable the campus to accomplish a number of activities, including a computer lab, an academic success center and a more efficient management system.

Dean May (Lifelong Learning) reported on preparations for Computers on Campus Conference at Hilton Head and announced that a second conference will be held in December.

Professor Greg Labyak reported for Dean Clayton (Salkehatchie) who was unable to attend. Professor Jane Brewer has been promoted to Associate Dean. A master plan of objectives to be accomplished over the next two years has been submitted by the Dean to the faculty for faculty input. The plan includes a number of faculty and staff hiring objectives. The new library building is still a high priority with CHE. The campus is establishing a Criminal Justice program in cooperation with South Carolina State College. The campus has an inter-collegiate basketball team in Walterboro which is receiving good support. Evening courses in Walterboro are doing well. Student attendance has increased for afternoon as well as evening courses.

I. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order.

II. Correction/Approval of Minutes

Chairman Willis asked for corrections and approval of the September 18, 1987 minutes. The secretary noted that all twelve of the System Tenure and Promotion Committee members are given in the minutes on page 13, section E. The chair noted that special orders (page 19) are part of standing rules and were not added to the agenda.

The minutes were approved with corrections.

III. Reports from University Officers

A. Dr. John J. Duffy, System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education (Attachment 1)

Having determined that everyone had a copy of his written report, Dr. Duffy stated that he would respond to questions.

Professor Powers (Sumter) asked for comments on the "Cutting Edge" brochure, particularly the portion titled "Upward Mobility" which emphasizes increased transferability of courses from technical schools.

Dr. Duffy stated the document requests that the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education limit the offerings of college parallel general education course in the nine technical colleges now authorized to offer college transfer credit. In general, the University supports the "Cutting Edge," particularly the monetary package. Reservations have been publicly expressed, particularly by the Provost, concerning those areas of the "Cutting Edge" felt to represent an invasion of University prerogatives. The President is on record as supporting the concept of the

"Cutting Edge"; the Provost is on record as having reservations about certain portions of the document. The two packages will go to the legislature: one will go to the Ways and Means Committee and the other will go to the education committees of the House and Senate.

Professor Willis (Union) asked how the University is voicing objections to certain parts of the "Cutting Edge."

Dr. Duffy replied that the University and Clemson have voiced to the Commission on Higher Education their objections, but the University does not want to sabotage a potentially positive program.

Professor Willis asked if the document is in its final form.

Dr. Duffy stated that the document now proceeds to the legislature. The CHE provided ample opportunity for input and has no plans to modify the document. Dr. Duffy's reservation, however, is that the University Campuses are not recognized. The CHE feels that University Campuses are covered under the University.

Professor Willis asked what opportunities might there be to promote the interests of the University Campuses as the document moves through the legislature.

Dr. Duffy replied that the University Campuses will have opportunities for input.

Professor Willis asked if the basic objection to the "Cutting Edge" by the University is the price to be paid for the monetary package.

Dr. Duffy stated the the University objects to the extension of authority into areas that have historically been the prerogatives of the University System.

Dr. Duffy completed his comments by congratulating Professor Alan Charles on his book.

B. Professor John Gardner, Associate Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education (Attachment 2)

Professor Gardner added to his written report a response to the Times 9 statement that the publication will no longer publish Senate reports. Times 9's survey results of its readership indicated that Senate reports were little read, thus, supporting the decision to discontinue the reports. The publication has plans to convert to a tabloid format which may or may not alter the decision to delete Senate reports. Times 9 asks, nevertheless, for subjects of interest, feature stories, etc., from the University Campuses.

On another issue, in an attachment to the Columbia Senate minutes, there was a motion to be acted upon at the November Senate meeting--a motion that would have restored membership from the University Campuses to the Faculty Library Committee. The motion was withdrawn from the floor and referred back to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee referred the issue to the Faculty Advisory Committee. Professor Gardner was asked to meet and met with the Faculty Advisory Committee. The matter was then referred back to the Steering Committee with no recommendation. Dr. Duffy and Professor Gardner will employ quick diplomacy to determine what more can be done to restore representation to that committee and will remain in continuous communication about the matter with the Senate leadership.

IV. Reports from Standing Committees

A. Rights and Responsibilities--Professor Charles Walker (Union)

Professor Walker made the following report:

"The Rights and Responsibilities Committee studied the various peer and student evaluation forms and decided to share the forms with each of the University Campuses. The Committee will continue to discuss the forms at the next meeting. The Committee also discussed the tenure and promotion procedures, but did not come to any unanimous conclusions. The Committee will continue this discussion at the next meeting, also."

Discussion followed. Professor Walker stated that by sharing the evaluation forms with the campuses, campuses may decide to modify their forms. The Committee was overwhelmed by the variety. When asked by Professor Willis if the Committee discussed the possibility of a common core of questions, Professor Walker replied that the Committee felt that was not a good idea.

Professor Willis then asked about the tenure and promotion discussion. The Committee, reported Professor Walker, could not reach a conclusion at this time. Professor Willis noted that sometimes individual campuses, because of their compositions, seem not to be in compliance with the Faculty Manual and asked whether the committee discussed whether all campuses fell within the boundaries of the Faculty Manual guidelines as far as qualifications and standards. Professor Walker replied that generally those are being met but the Committee didn't wish to change the flavor of the different campuses, feeling that it was not their prerogative to do so. Professor Willis commented that though numbers sometimes may not be met because of campus size, as long as campuses followed the intent of the guidelines, perhaps things are in accordance. However, a

question is what oversight function do the University Campuses have over compliance with the manual on tenure and promotion procedures on the individual campuses. Dr. Duffy replied that his office is responsible; however, he isn't aware of variations. On the other hand, since committee compositions pose potential legal problems, Dr. Duffy's office will check with the Deans to determine if procedures are being followed. Professor Labyak (Salkehatchie) raised the issue of double jeopardy which could arise, particularly on small campuses. Professor Willis asked if decisions are invalid when committees are not composed of the proper number of people. Dr. Duffy replied if committee size adjustments are made based on valid, specified reasons, then there should be no problem.

Professor Willis asked if the Rights and Responsibilities Committee discussed the grievance issue, in particular tenured versus non-tenured members. Professor Walker replied that the discussion is continuing. He stated that the Committee agrees that they should serve as the Grievance Committee but have not resolved whether non-tenured faculty should serve on that committee. Professor Willis noted that the Grievance Committee in Columbia is composed of only tenured personnel. Professor Powers (Sumter) asked if there is serious discussion of reviving the idea of a separate Grievance Committee--apart form the Rights and Responsibilities Committee--which never meets unless there is a grievance, composed of only tenured faculty, allowing the Rights and Responsibilities Committee to continue to carry on their work. Professor Walker replied that there was discussion. Professor Gardner stated that recent legal actions involving a tenured faculty member illustrate that options allowed under the University Campuses Faculty Manual are at variance with those allowed in other sections of the System and point to the need for a serious review of tenure and promotion procedures since there is vulnerability to litigation. The University's legal office has requested an external opinion of our grievance structure. Once that opinion is received, it will be forwarded to the Senate... (may mean Manual changes).

Professor Stone (Salkehatchie) asked if there are any "unwritten" tenure and promotion rules. Professor Willis suggested that if they exist, they are campus specific.

Professor Boulware (Beaufort) asked if we can infer that there may be legal problems with an untenured grievance committee. Professor Gardner replied that two years ago legal counsel advised that there was a potential problem. However, the point Professor Gardner referred to earlier concerned the procedures by which faculty are terminated, and how the grievance procedure supports that and rights of due process. It is preferable that there be no ambiguity about rights of due process.

Professor West (Sumter) stated that the University's legal department had the Faculty Manual for more than nine months before it was published and the questions raised now should have been raised then.

Dr. Duffy stated that the section on faculty removal was copied from the Columbia manual. Columbia has since changed that section on removal of tenure and the University Campuses haven't. The recent case is the first time in the history of the University that there has been a removal of tenure.

B. Welfare--Professor Don Curlovic (Sumter)

Professor Curlovic reported that Committee discussion focused on salary information and the idea of a salary schedule.

The Welfare Committee voted unanimously that the following be read at the afternoon session:

> "The information that the Committee received from Milt Baker concerning salaries given by range and required by FOI, is interesting, but the Committee, is still waiting for the salary information as requested at the April Beaufort meeting."

FOI requires that salary information be released in $4,000 increments, but the information requested in April asked for

1. a listing of salaries, without names, along with percentage increases and

2. the salary study that has been done over the last four to five years.

Dr. Baker is waiting on information in order to fulfill the latter request. We will have that information at the next meeting.

Discussion ensued.

Professor Gardner stated that the Vice President's office has asked for information from the appropriate people. The Personnel and Legal departments have not yet responded as to how much of the requested information can be released in accordance with FOI. As soon as that information is received, it will be given to the Committee.

Dr. Duffy asked if the Committee had received a listing of all faculty salaries as provided for by FOI.

Professor Curlovic replied that the information was received, listing names and salaries in $4,000 increments; however,

the request asked for specific dollar amounts of all salaries for 1987-88 for all faculty on each campus without names attached. Professor Willis asked what the Committee will do with the information already received. Professor Curlovic replied that each Committee member has a copy of the FOI salary report and faculty of each campus can view the report by contacting the Committee member(s) on that campus.

Professor Costello (Sumter) commented that the salary information report reveals that some full-time teaching faculty make $20,000 more a year than others and the whole concept of percentage raises being fair should be questioned. Someone making $40,000 a year would receive twice as much money when receiving the same percentage raise as someone making $20,000 a year. The Committee should consider this issue in its deliberation.

Professor Boulware (Beaufort) stated that a response to the request (under FOI) should have been made within fifteen days. If the request from the Vice President's office was sent in August, it is taking an inordinate amount of time to process.

Dr. Duffy replied that this is a request from his office to another office of the University. The information requested may not involve FOI.

Professor Curlovic stated that the FOI reported received by the Committee would not be a part of his formal report and would not be attached to the minutes.

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

Professor Costello reported that the Committee gathered data on curricular disarticulation within the System. In some cases, the problems encountered could be dealt with mainly by good advising and by anticipating the problems. The Committee is continuing to gather data and hope to get input from division chairpersons and academic deans and others who are aware of problems with transferring courses. The Committee considered a proposal for a Mini-Faculty Exchange Program for the University Campuses, submitted through the Executive Committee, written by Professor Arthur Mitchell (Salkehatchie). The Committee reacted favorably to the idea, but felt some revisions were needed and referred the proposal back to Professor Mitchell.

Discussion followed.

Professor Willis asked had someone been appointed by President Holderman to handle articulation problems for the System. Professor Gardner replied that the Provost's office might well be the appropriate office. Dr. Duffy stated that problems of which he has been aware have all

been resolvable, but he wishes to know the extent of the problem, and looks forward to the report from IUSC.

Professor Willis commented that some of the problems are attitudinal problems which lead to personnel from other campuses providing misinformation about transferability to students with the hope that the students will take the courses from the campus to which they plan to transfer.

V. Executive Committee--Professor Deborah Cureton (Lancaster)

Professor Cureton reported that the Executive Committee, at the meeting on October 30, discussed the response to the Time 9 issue, the problem of the University Campuses representation on the Library Committee, and the proposal for the Mini-Faculty Exchange Program. The Committee was advised that an evolving issue on one campus questions the relationship between the local faculty organization and the University Campuses Faculty Senate. The Committee received the names of the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee members from Salkehatchie: Professors Marion Preacher and Bob Group. The alternate representative to the Faculty Welfare Committee is Professor Betty Youmans (Salkehatchie). It was decided that the Nominating Committee members would be chosen by the February 19, 1988, Senate meeting.

During the morning session, discussion continued on the library committee representation issue. The Committee wanted to reaffirm to each campus delegation the importance of representation of the University Campuses to the Columbia Senate. Columbia Senate representatives should be encouraged to be more participatory.

The core curriculum was discussed; however, the Committee is not sure what constitutes the core curriculum and decided it would be in the interest of the faculties to locate and distribute the core curriculum which becomes effective in 1988. The discussion of procedures for establishing the Nominating Committee was tabled. The Committee will begin gathering data on developmental course offerings on the University Campuses and reviewed a method by which to gather the data. Finally, the Committee reviewed the term of office of the University Campuses' representatives to the Curricula and Courses Committee and submits the following motion:

> The Executive Committee moves that the USC University Campuses Faculty Manual be amended to change the last sentence on page 13 from "the term of office is one year" to "the term of office is three years," and that this amendment take effect upon the election of the new representative to the Curricula and Courses Committee at the Senate's April meeting.

Motion from Committee needing no second, Chairman Willis asked for discussion. He explained the action would make the term of representation to the Curricula and Courses Committee consistent to the terms of representation to other Special Committees. Since approval will necessitate a change in the Faculty Manual,

the motion can only be discussed at this meeting and will be voted upon at the February meeting. There was no further discussion of the motion.

Chairman Willis commented on other areas of the report. Concerning Library Committee representation, he stated that the Committee was reorganized to include six elected members and three presidential appointees and asked Professor Gardner, if other avenues fail, would the University Campuses be able to have representation by a presidential appointment. Professor Gardner through that would be possible.

Chairman Willis stressed again the importance of representation on the Columbia Senate and stated that the Executive Committee is exploring ways to increase articulation between the University Campuses Faculty Senate and University Campuses Senators on the Columbia Senate. Professor West reemphasized how important active representation is, lest gains already made be eroded. Professor Willis stated that nominating guidelines under discussion may facilitate more effective selection of representatives...those willing to be active and involved. Other recommendations may be forthcoming.

The self-study issue was discussed and the Executive Committee will be compiling a list of the self-study directors from each campus.

Professor Willis asked if anyone had the most current information about the core curriculum. Professor Gardner replied that the Columbia Senate adopted a proposal nearly two years ago. It has been received by various governance groups since. Professor Gardner will secure a copy of the core curriculum from the Columbia Senate office and will forward to Chairman Willis.

Professor Willis stated that the Executive Committee will gather as much information as possible about developmental course offerings and make that information available.

VI. Reports of Special Committees

A. University Library Committee--
Professor Lori Broome Harris (Lancaster)

No report.

B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses--
Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter)

Professor Powers (Sumter) reported for Professor Castleberry. "In the last Columbia Senate meeting Provost Borkowski announced that the core curriculum would be in place for fall 1988. Our committee anticipates many program revisions coming to our committee in the spring so that colleges and schools will be in conformity with the core.

The art program has gone through extensive revision. (Academic officers for each campus should have my note on this--if not, please give me a call.) The Columbia Senate acts on the revisions later this month.

This is the most relevant material for our campuses."

C. University Faculty Welfare Committee--
Professor Hussein Zeidan (Salkehatchie)

Professor Labyak (Salkehatchie) reported for Professor Zeidan. The Faculty Welfare Committee is continuing its study of faculty benefits based on the survey conducted a few months ago. The committee is still soliciting input. If there are questions or comments, please contact Professor Zeidan.

D. Academic Planning Committee--Professor Bob Group (Salkehatchie)

Professor Labyak reported for Professor Group (See Attachment 3).

E. Board of Trustees Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee--Professor William Cordray (Beaufort)

Professor Labyak reported for Professor Cordray (See Attachment 4).

F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee--
Professor Noni Bohonak (Lancaster)

Professor Bohonak reported that the Committee has made its decisions. Recipients should receive notification soon. $61,000 were requested but only $16,000 were available. Nine of 24 proposals were partially funded...about 75% of each proposal. There was discussion. Professor Gardner asked if there would be another funding cycle this year. Professor Bohonak replied that new moneys will be available in the spring and information has been disseminated. Professor Bohonak has that information if anyone did not receive it. Requests for money should be of professional quality; the competition is stiff.

G. System Committee--Professor Tandy Willis (Union)

Professor Willis reported that at the System Meeting, discussion involved the 2001 report and the "Cutting Edge". Although the University is generally supportive of the "Cutting Edge," there remain areas of disagreement: the floor on admissions, the oversight role over assessment proposed by the CHE, and the approach toward developmental programs.

Another item involved a proposal that the study body president of USC-Columbia become a voting member of the

Board of Trustees, an issue under scrutiny in the House Education Committee and not favored by President Holderman.

When asked to react, Dr. Duffy cited several points of consideration. Why should just the Columbia student body president become a member of the Board when there are nine campuses? Why should students have voting representation when faculty do not? Members of the Board of Trustees should be residents of the state. That condition is not required to become student body president.

Professor Willis continued his report. Self-study directors for reaccreditation have been selected. The directors will strive for systemwide coordination. Returning to the "Cutting Edge," he noted that University Campuses would be exempt from the admissions floor as established by CHE; however, the baccalaureate degree granting campuses potentially may lose many students.

VII. Unfinished Business

Chairman Willis called for unfinished business. There was none.

VIII. New Business

The Chair called for new business. There was none.

IX. Announcements

Chairman Willis asked for announcements.

Dr. Duffy announced that a friend needs a house-sitter and requested that interested parties be referred to him.

Professor Cureton announced the South Carolina Black Student Association convention, co-hosted by the Commission on Higher Education, to be held in Columbia on November 21 and 22.

Professor Gardner was congratulated on an article about the Freshman Year Experience that appeared in The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Professor Gardner announced the Women's Studies Conference to be held in Columbia on February 5, 1988.

Special acknowledgements were given to Dean Davis, Professor Martin, Ms. Odell, Ms. Carter, Ms. Horn, the Student Government Association and Professor Alan Charles for their work in orchestrating a very pleasant Senate visit to the Union Campus.

The Chair asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was made and seconded and the Senate adjourned. A reception was held at Rose Hill State Park.

ATTENDANCE, NOVEMBER 13, 1987

BEAUFORT

Present

- Rick Boulware
- Dave McCollum
- Somers Miller
- Jane Upshaw
- John Blair (alternate)

Absent

- Graham Tomlinson

LANCASTER

Present

- Noni Bohonak
- Deborah Cureton
- Shari Lohela
- Darlene McManus
- Wayne Thurman
- Wade Chittam
- William Riner (alternate)

Absent

- Jerry Currence

LIFELONG LEARNING

Present

- Linda Allman
- Steve Dalton
- John Stine
- Nancy Washington

SALKEHATCHIE

Present

- Greg Labyak
- Paul Stone
- Cynthia McMillian (alternate)
- Dan Ruff (alternate)

Absent

- Marion Preacher
- Ali Pyarali

SUMTER

Present

- Robert Costello
- Con Curlovic
- Jean Hatcher
- Jordy Johnson
- Kay Oldhouser
- Tom Powers
- John Varner
- Carolyn West
- John Logue (alternate)

Absent

- Sal Macias

UNION

Present

- Mary Barton
- Julie Fielder
- Charles Walker
- Tandy Willis
- Allan Charles (alternate)

Attachment 1

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

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

(803) 777-7695

REPORT OF THE SYSTEM VICE PRESIDENT FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE USC-Union November 13, 1987

Budget

The State budget for the next fiscal year is now being formulated. The Governor has already presented his version of the budget to the Budget and Control Board. They are currently deliberating, and we should have some idea of what state appropriations including higher education will be by the end of November. Currently, as you know, we are funded at 88% of full formula but there is hope that significant strides can be made toward the achievement of full formula funding for next year. In addition, there is a bill called the Research Initiative Act which would set aside some funds for research at the three major universities.

The Cutting Edge

I am distributing along with these remarks, a brochure on The Cutting Edge. This describes the proposal which the Commission on Higher Education plans to ask the General Assembly to approve this year.

Recognition of TWIGS

We are proceeding with our plans to gain recognition for the off-campus programs at Walterboro, Laurens, Camden, and Hilton Head. The situation has been somewhat complicated by the fact that these proposals will go forth as part of a much larger package since the other campuses of the University and Columbia itself must secure approval for these programs under new regulations of the Commission on Higher Education. The Southern Association at its December meeting will consider a change in its regulations which would require the visitation and accreditation of all campus centers if they offer 25% of a degree program. This Southern Association issue is all the more reason for us to proceed with the proposal of the programs to the Commission on Higher Education.

Award

I wish to call attention to the fact that Telecommunications Instruction received the Innovative Programs Award at the last NUCEA Region III for the program, The American South Comes of Age.

Attachment 2

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

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

(803) 777-7695

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
USC-Union
November 13, 1987

Family Fund

The 1987 Family Fund Campaign is drawing near to its conclusion. Preliminary reports are that the drive has gone well. I will provide more precise figures at the February Faculty Senate Meeting.

Faculty Exchange

The deadline for the Faculty Exchange application submissions is Monday, November 16. If for any reason you or any of your colleagues have not received applications or notice of the opportunity to make application, please notify me immediately so that I can extend the deadline. Last year, 13 of the 21 Faculty Exchange participants were from the five University Campuses. I hope we can do that well again this year.

Academic Affairs Administrators Conference

I wanted you to know that I had invited all of your colleagues who are not Faculty Senators to attend a conference in Columbia being held on the same day as our Faculty Senate meeting. The reason you were not included on this invitation is because I did not want to pose any conflict with the more important business of the Faculty Senate that same day. I am sure you understand.

Attendance of the University Campuses' Representatives to the Columbia Senate

I noticed that of the nine University Campuses' Faculty Senators who serve on the Columbia Faculty Senate, only three were in attendance at the October 7 meeting. The practical consequence of this was that three campuses (Beaufort, Salkehatchie, and Union) were totally unrepresented.

Freshman Year Experience Conference

You will be receiving notification prior to our next Senate meeting of the opportunity to participate in the February 20-24, 1988 National Conference on the Freshman Year Experience at USC-Columbia. This Office will underwrite the cost of your participation and I hope that many of you will choose to do so.

Congratulations to USC-Union, Professor Allan Charles

It would be inappropriate if I did not, while I'm on the campus which is Professor Allan Charles' home campus, USC-Union, recognize him for the tremendous accomplishment of his recent publication of The Narrative History of Union County. This 600+ page volume was ten years in the preparation and is testimony of the kind of scholarship the University Campuses faculty undertake that supports and relates to the primary mission of teaching effectiveness. I'm sure you will all join me in saluting our colleague, Allan Charles.

Attachment 3

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SALKEHATCHIE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

P. O. Box 617
Allendale, S. C. 29810
(803) 584-3446

P. O. Box 1337
Walterboro, S. C. 29488
(803) 549-6314

DATE: November 11, 1987

TO: UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

FROM: ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE

The University's Academic Planning Committee met on Tuesday, October 20, 1987, and set its agenda for the coming year. Each member was given a copy of the "Cutting Edge" proposal for review and was asked to prepare comments to be presented at the Committee's next meeting, Tuesday, November 17.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Robert Group
Academic Planning Representative

cb

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND FACULTY LIAISON COMMITTEE

The Board of Trustees Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee met at 2:30 p.m., Thursday, November 12, 1987 in Room 107-C of the Osborne Building.

The following items were approved:

Proposed Master of Arts Degree in Religious Studies
Proposed Bachelor of Arts in Contemporary European Studies

Other matters of a confidential nature were discussed.

Respectfully submitted,

William T. Cordray

MEMO

DATE: 13 November 1987

TO: Dr. D. Cureton

FROM: Noni Bohonak

RE: Research and Productive Scholarship

The Research and Productive Scholarship committees have met to review applications for the current year. I was on the committee for science, engineering and mathematics which met on November 10th. Approximately $16000 was awarded with requests reaching over $60000. We were able to partially fund one-third of the applicants.

The other "non-science" groups should have their funds awarded soon. Official notification should be received in the near future for those applicants fortunate to receive a grant.