

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

APRIL 22, 1988

USC-BEAUFORT AT HILTON HEAD

Informal Session

Chairman Tandy Willis welcomed the Senate delegation and thanked USC-Beaufort for hosting our meeting on Hilton Head Island. The Chairman opened the morning session by asking for remarks from the Deans.

Dean Tuttle (Beaufort) welcomed the group to Hilton Head Island. He reported that things are proceeding well for the Beaufort and Hilton Head campuses. He noted the help and work of state Senator Waddell to establish a permanent campus at Hilton Head and to establish a Coastal Zone Education Center which conducts marine science education programs for grades five through twelve, graduate studies, and continuing education programs. That facility will open beside the Waddell Mariculture Center.

Dean Arnold (Lancaster) did not attend.

Dean May (Lifelong Learning) reported a successful faculty retreat at the Baruch Institute and expected a good ending to the semester. He announced the Adult Learner Conference, May 23, 1988, and invited those interested in attending to contact his office.

Dean Clayton (Salkehatchie) reported an excellent year, including a 20% enrollment increase. Faculty are currently involved in five searches for new or replacement faculty. Walterboro continues to grow and renovation of the main classroom building is in progress. The campus is optimistic that the legislature will fund a new library.

Dean Anderson (Sumter) reported a number of activities. The campus has revamped its computer system, replacing Burrows computers with IBM and IBM compatible equipment. Relationships with Sumter County School District II are being strengthened through the Academic Center by providing more college credit courses to high school students. Physical changes to the campus include revamping the older buildings and adding a second floor to the administration building. The campus is optimistic about the success of a \$4.3 million request to the legislature for a library addition. A library staff and faculty committee are pursuing a Title III grant that will enable the campus to develop a joint coordination project linking the campus library with the Sumter Tech and Sumter County libraries. The campus is beginning a \$250,000 foundation campaign. A task force study on recruitment recently has been

completed and the campus is implementing some of the resulting recommendations. Sumter hosted the Second Annual Carolina Five Tournament, a fun day of activities that involved four of the five University Campuses.

Dean Davis (Union) stated a continued concern about enrollment. A faculty/staff/student retention and recruitment activity study committee studied the situation during the spring for ways to enhance retention of traditional students. Their report will be ready in May and the campus will implement appropriate recommendations. Union will hold its first Honors Convocation on May 1 to recognize Dean's List and President's List students and incoming scholarship recipients. Coach Willie Jeffries will be the speaker, thanks to a mid-year desegregation grant. Mr. Jeffries was formerly head football coach at South Carolina State College; the first black coach of a major white university, Wichita State; and is now head coach at Howard University, Washington, DC. He is also a native of Union, SC. Commencement exercises this year will mark the first official use of the nearly completed central building. Dean Davis announced that Professor Tandy Willis, Chair, University Campuses Faculty Senate, was chosen USC-Union's Teacher of the Year.

Professor Gregory Labyak (Salkehatchie), chairman of the Nominating Committee, reported that the committee met on March 25, 1988, and selected the following nominees:

Executive Committee

Vice Chair	Deborah Cureton (Lancaster)
Secretary	Nancy Washington (Lifelong Learning)
Member At-Large	Rick Boulware
Member At-Large	Carolyn West (Sumter)

According to the University Campuses Faculty Manual, the positions of Chair and Immediate Past Chair are filled by succession; therefore, Greg Labyak is to serve as Chair and Tandy Willis as Immediate Past Chair for 1988-89.

Special Committees

University Library Committee	John Catalano (Lancaster) John Stine (Lifelong Learning) recommended as alternate
Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee	no nominee
Research and Productive Scholarship Committee	Noni Bohonak (Lancaster)

Curricula and Courses Committee (three-year term)
Robert Castleberry
(Sumter)

Academic Forward Planning Committee (three-year term)
Bruce Nims (Lancaster)

Hussein Zeidan (Salkehatchie) will continue his three-year term on the Faculty Welfare Committee, and the Chair of the Senate represents the University Campuses Faculty Senate on the System Committee.

Professor Labyak made the following recommendations on behalf of the Nominating Committee:

The Nominating Committee, recognizing the special importance of University Campuses representation on the Library Committee, in light of recent difficulties (the removal of our representative for a period of several months, then reinstatement), recommends John Stine as an alternate representative to that body. This recommendation helps to insure that we are represented at all meetings of the Library Committee. Recognizing that the chair has power to designate an alternate, the Committee felt it beneficial in this case to officially designate an alternate in this manner, someone known to be committed to serving in the event that the nominee cannot. In addition, the Committee wishes to stress the importance of having Special Committee representatives regularly attend both meetings of their committees and the University Campuses Faculty Senate, in order to answer questions and respond to concerns that the Senate may have regarding the committee reports.

Professor Labyak announced that further nominations would be taken from the floor during the formal session.

Chairman Willis then introduced the morning speaker: Mr. Charles O'Shields from the University of South Carolina Budget Office. Mr. O'Shields thanked the Senate for their warmth and hospitality. He spoke to the group about the process by which the state appropriates money.

The Board of Economic Advisors begins the process by appraising the state's economic outlook. Revenue estimates tend to be conservative. Once an economic forecast is done, an appropriation formula is used to distribute money for higher education. The formula is heavily student driven. The full time equivalent student factor is significant in determining the amount of money.

First the number of FTE faculty needed for each discipline must be computed, based on the number of FTE students in the given discipline according to the student faculty ratio. Then FTE faculty is multiplied by a peer group faculty salary average.

Once salary costs are determined for each discipline, the instructional support percentages must be determined. Salaries plus support costs equal total cost of instruction.

Then 25% of the previous year's research and public service costs is computed.

Academic support libraries receive a factor of 10% of the total cost of instruction.

Academic support--other, an umbrella category, is 12% of the research and public service cost.

Funding for student service activities is computed thusly: \$150.00 for the first 4000 (head-count) students, \$125.00 for the second, \$100.00 for the third, and \$75.00 for all others. In addition, \$3.00 per credit hour produced is allowed.

Operation and maintenance of plant is computed on a series of formulas (custodial services formula, building maintenance formula, grounds maintenance formula, actual cost of utilities, etc.). The sum of all these formulas produces the amount for operation and plant maintenance.

Institutional support (such as business office) equals 15% of total of previous sum or \$50,000, whichever is larger.

Unique costs (usually site specific) and state employer contributions become factors.

Once all computations have been totaled, the total is multiplied by 20% and that is the amount the institution must self-generate. Eighty percent of that total is the amount of state funds the formula generates.

It should be understood that full formula funding by the state means providing 80% of the money needed (according to the formula) for institutional functioning.

Full formula funding would be 100% of the 80% of the formula total that the state should provide. The institution must still generate 20% of general needs.

Currently, the legislature is discussing funding higher education at 93% of the formula. Ninety-three percent represents only about 75% of actual need.

When salary increases are mandated, still only 80% is funded by the state. Differences must be internally generated.

Student fees are one means to fill the gap between what is needed and what is provided. Student fees may increase by \$50.00 next year.

Currently the salary package is being discussed at a 4% funding level. It means that the pool of dollars is 4% of the base. A range of increase can be made available, from 0%-8%. Again, extra money must be internally generated.

Mr. O'Shields concluded that there is optimism that state funding will look considerably better for higher education this year than last year.

Professor Costello (Sumter) asked if the 80% funding by the state applied to staff as well as faculty. Mr. O'Shields said it does. However, staff raises are subject to a different plan. Staff raises are normally subject to ranges.

Professor Costello asked what kind of a correlation is there between the dollars generated by the formula and what is actually used in an operating budget? Mr. O'Shields stated that President Holderman maintains that if full-formula funding is consistent, then the University can progress. However in previous years funding has fallen, presenting difficulties.

Professor Costello rephrased his question to ask whether money earmarked for salaries, for example, can be used for other purposes. Mr. O'Shields answered that the University is considered a "lump-sum" agency. However, the wage package almost always exceeds the amount calculated for it. Differences come from some other category such as maintenance.

Dean Davis (Union) asked if Mr. O'Shield's office is responsible for providing the factors used by the CHE formula. Mr. O'Shields stated that the institution provides the information and Pete Denton coordinates and compiles the information generated.

Dean Davis then asked if funds acquired through grants would have a positive impact on the public service component of the formula in the following year. Mr. O'Shields said it would.

Dean May (Lifelong Learning) remarked that the 25% is actually a 20% pay-out.

Mr. O'Shields concurred. He noted too that a 2% mid-year budget cut is actually a 4% cut, because the 2% is computed on an annual amount.

There were no more questions and Mr. O'Shields thanked the Senate for the opportunity to meet with them.

Chairman Willis then reminded the Standing Committee members to elect new chairpersons for the following year and adjourned the Senate to Standing Committee meetings.

GENERAL SESSION

I. Call to Order

Chairman Willis called the formal session to order and reminded the membership to identify themselves when speaking and to provide written committee reports to the secretary.

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes

The chair asked for corrections to the minutes of the Senate meeting held at USC-Lancaster on February 19, 1988. Hearing none, he requested and received motion and second to approve those minutes.

Before receiving reports from University Officers, Chairman Willis asked newly elected Senators to introduce themselves. Presenting themselves to the Senate were Professors Milton Harden (Salkehatchie), Bruce Nims (Lancaster), John Logue (Sumter), and Robert Castleberry (Sumter). Professor John Catalano (Lancaster) had been present during the morning session but was unable to remain during the afternoon.

III. Reports from University Officers

A. Dr. John J. Duffy, Chancellor for University Campuses and Continuing Education

Dr. Duffy announced that three important searches are currently in progress: for Provost, for Vice-President of Computer Affairs, and for Dean of Education. He reported on the progress of the Provost search. The search committee for the Provost has invited nine candidates, from a pool of approximately one hundred and seventy, to come to Columbia. On Monday, the group will be reduced to four or five. Dr. Duffy agreed to answer questions about the information provided by Mr. O'Shields during the morning session and about Professor Gardner's report. There were no questions.

B. Professor John N. Gardner, Vice Chancellor for University Campuses and Continuing Education

Professor Gardner, though unable to attend, provided a written report. See Attachment 1.

IV. Reports from Standing Committees

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

Professor Walker moved that the Senate approve the revision of letters that are to be sent to tenure and promotion applicants. (See original wording of letters in University Campus Senate Minutes, April 24, 1987, p. 19).

Revised Tenure and Promotion Letters

- A. The University campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee met on (Date) and recommends you for (promotion to _____ and/or tenure). This recommendation has not been reviewed by the Administration of the University. This decision is not final until the Administration's and Committee's recommendations are acted on by the Board of Trustees.
- B. The University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee met on (date) and has recommended you for _____; however, the Committee has not recommended you for _____ at this time. These recommendations have not been reviewed by the Administration of the University. These decisions are not final until the Administration's and the Committee's recommendations are acted on by the Board of Trustees.

If you wish to appeal the Committee's action with regard to _____ you may do so by letter to me, through the Office of the Chancellor as outlined in the University Campuses Faculty Manual.

- C. The University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee met on (date) and does not recommend you for (promotion to _____ and/or tenure). This recommendation has not been reviewed by the Administration of the University. This decision is not final until the Administration's and the Committee's recommendations are acted on by the Board of Trustees.

If you wish to appeal the Committee's action with regard to _____, you may do so by letter to me, through the Office of the Chancellor as outlined in the University Campuses Faculty Manual.

The letters are to be sent by the chairperson of the Tenure and Promotion Committee and they state that the recommendations of the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee are not final--they must be reviewed by the administration of the University and acted upon by the Board of Trustees--and provide a statement of the right to grieve those recommendations.

Chairman Willis stated that a motion from Committee requires no second and asked for discussion. There was no discussion and the motion passed.

Professor Walker reported on a matter discussed in previous Senate meetings: What constitutes a 'simple majority' during the deliberation of the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee? (See University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, February 19, 1987, p. 10). The Committee

moved to delete the sentence, "Votes on all questions will pass by simple majority", from the revised TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES approved April 24, 1987, at USC-Beaufort. (See University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, April 24, 1987, p. 19).

Professor Walker presented the Committee's sentiment that the change will allow each Tenure and Promotion Committee to govern itself on that matter.

There ensued a substantial amount of discussion during which Professors Logue and Willis stated that the deletion of that sentence allows the Committee's recommendation and vote to be forwarded to the next level of review.

Chairman Willis stated that the motion constitutes a change in the manual. Such revisions qualify as a substantial issue, usually brought forth in one meeting and voted upon during the next, unless there is a motion to suspend the rules by a two-thirds vote.

Professor Powers (Sumter), on a point of order, stated that by-laws cannot be suspended by a two-thirds vote. Only rules of order of a meeting can be suspended.

There was discussion of appropriate procedures for handling the motion.

Professor Upshaw (Beaufort), referring to The University Campuses Faculty Manual, page 15, quoted, "The Senate follows Robert's Rules of Order in conducting its business, unless otherwise provided for in the By-laws or the standing rules." She continued that Robert's Rules of Order allows for action on the matter with a two-thirds vote.

Professor Macias substantiated the point.

The Senate voted to suspend the rules and consider the motion of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

The motion to delete the sentence containing "simple majority" was passed.

Professor Walker then called on Professor Carolyn West (Sumter) to deliver a sub-committee report. The sub-committee, chaired by Professor West, met on March 25, 1988. The action taken by the sub-committee was approved during the day's Rights and Responsibilities Committee meeting and brought forward to the Senate. The first motion was to establish a Grievance Committee for the University Campuses. The Rights and Responsibilities Committee moves that a Grievance Committee be established for the University Campuses Faculty to be composed of six members, one from each University Campus and one from Lifelong Learning.

Members will be elected by the campus faculty organization, must be tenured and may be senators. Members may succeed themselves. The Committee shall be elected before the April Faculty Senate meeting and will serve for one year. The committee will elect its own chair at the first Faculty Senate meeting of the year.

Chairman Willis stated that no second was needed and asked for discussion.

Professor Dockery (Lifelong Learning) asked if the Grievance Committee would be a Standing Committee, necessitating an earlier election of a chairperson for that person to attend the retreat and be involved in Senate business. Professor West replied that the Grievance Committee was not intended to be a Standing Committee nor was it intended that Grievance committee members necessarily attend Senate meetings, only the initial meeting in order to elect a chair.

Chairman Willis requested Professor West to provide background information that precipitated the motion. Professor West stated that grievance procedures have gone to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee and many members of that committee are non-tenured. The Rights and Responsibilities Committee feels that it may be disadvantageous for a non-tenured member to deal with a grievance.

An option not chosen was to allow only tenured persons to serve on the Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

Professor Thurman (Lancaster) asked how Grievance Committee members would be chosen.

Professor West stated that the members would be elected by each faculty organization.

When discussion ended, Chairman Willis called for the vote, and the motion passed.

Professor West continued the report with a second motion. This motion represents a change in the Faculty Manual. The Faculty Manual currently allows two routes to appeal a notice of termination. One route is cited on page 25 which states that an appeal could be made to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, and the other is cited on page 65 which states that the appeal could be made to the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee. The question arises as to which body has precedence if one chooses to appeal to both. The motion was made to change the wording on page 25 of the Faculty Manual to make it consistent to what is on page 65, allowing one route of appeal--to the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Original wording, p. 25, University Campuses Faculty Manual

Any faculty member whose appointment may be terminated for cause under the provision of this paragraph shall be notified in writing; this notification shall include a detailed statement of the grounds for termination and an explanation of his/her right to a hearing with counsel before the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. A request for hearing must be submitted in writing to the President within fifteen days of the receipt of notification of termination. If the faculty member elects to request a hearing, the effective date of his/her termination shall not be in advance of the final decision of the Executive Committee, although the President shall have the authority in the meantime to suspend the faculty member in question until proceedings have been completed.

Proposed revision:

Any faculty member whose appointment may be terminated for cause under the provision of this paragraph shall be notified in writing; this notification shall include a detailed statement of the grounds for termination and an explanation of his/her right to a hearing with counsel before the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the Board of Trustees. A request for hearing must be submitted in writing to the President within fifteen days of the receipt of notification of termination. If the faculty member elects to request a hearing, the effective date of his/her termination shall not be in advance of the final decision of the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee, although the President shall have the authority in the meantime to suspend the faculty member in question until proceedings have been completed.

The chair asked for discussion. Professor Powers wondered whether the University Campuses' representative to the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee would have to be tenured as a result of this action. Professor West stated that the Committee did not discuss that.

There was no further discussion. The Chair called for the vote and the motion passed.

Professor West continued the report, stating that some grievance issues still needed clarification; however, there was not enough time in this session to deal with them adequately.

She recommended that the issues be carried over by the Rights and Responsibilities Committee into the next session along with information generated about those issues during this session.

Professor Walker then thanked Professor Logue for his invaluable assistance and time as adviser to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee, Dean Anderson for his support, and Professor West for chairing the subcommittee. Professor Walker ended the report of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee by announcing Professor John Logue as the committee chairman for next year.

B. Welfare--Professor Don Curlovic (Sumter)

Professor Curlovic presented a motion from the Welfare committee to the Senate to accept and approve the recommendations for the continuation of the salary study and recommendation for salary increases. (See Attachment 2)

Brought to the Senate's attention was the information in 1.C. (All salary information provided by Milt Baker via John Gardner to the Welfare Committee which was provided by the System Office of Institutional Research should be given to the Welfare Committee for 1988-89 salaries.) and 2.B. (Particular attention should be given to length of service and total years of experience with regard to low-end adjustments. As a model for these low-end adjustments, local school district salary schedules should be used so that, as a minimum, a faculty member's salary would be that of a primary or secondary teacher's salary based on years of experience and educational level.), new information not contained in last year's recommendations.

The motion required no second and the chair called for discussion. Professor Curlovic stated that the format of the requested information would not breach the confidentiality of any one individual since at least six persons on each campus would fall into each category.

There was no further discussion and the motion passed.

Professor Curlovic thanked the Chancellor's Office for all the information generated for and provided to the Welfare Committee. He then asked Dr. Duffy that if a new multiplier were to be used in the funding formula and generated more money for the faculty salary factor, would that money be used for faculty salary.

Dr. Duffy stated that if the state funds a 4% raise, the intention is still to award a salary package ranging from 0-8%. There will also be a request made to the President to allow 3% from operating resources to be added to the salary budget which would allow salaries to range from 0-11% increase. However, salary packages cannot be directly related to the formula. It may be disadvantageous to do so. The University has been paying higher salaries than those indicated by the formula.

Professor Curlovic ended his report by announcing the election of Professor Mary Barton (Union) as chair of the Welfare Committee next year.

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

Professor Costello submitted the following report.

In its meetings on Thursday, April 21 and Friday, April 22 the committee dealt with five issues:

1. A report on curricula articulation within the USC System
2. Selection of a chairman for next year
3. A proposal for a Visiting Scholars Program
4. A preliminary proposal for a uniform University Campuses core curriculum for AA and AS degrees, and
5. Procedure for creating new courses and the use of the UCAM course designator

In regards to item 1, curricular articulation, I shall read our report for insertion into the minutes.

REPORT OF THE INTRA-UNIVERSITY SERVICES AND
COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF
CURRICULAR ARTICULATION WITHIN THE
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA SYSTEM, APRIL, 1988

Part I. Rationale

During the 1987-88 academic year the Intra-University Services and Communication Committee of the University Campuses Faculty Senate has undertaken a survey of the status of curricular articulation within the entire USC System. Nowhere can one find a greater dedication to the smooth function of the system than among the University Campuses. Since none of these campuses currently has baccalaureate degree-granting authority each must be concerned with transferability of credits both to the Columbia campus and to any one of the three smaller baccalaureate degree-granting institutions in the USC System.

Clearly, divergence of course descriptions for basic courses among the Columbia, Aiken, Coastal and Spartanburg campuses represents a major detriment to the University Campuses' effective function, as such divergence either reduces a student's change of campus

options or produces an expensive proliferation of course offering on the University Campuses. An equally frustrating problem for the University Campuses has been the occasional arbitrary refusal of academic officers at four-year institutions to accept course work done on University Campuses for credit in degree programs.

We urge the University to take concrete steps to move rapidly toward the goals articulated in its 2001 Report "...to foster consideration on each campus for the impact that decisions may have on other campuses and on the system." It is our hope that Part II of this report will provide increased motivation for this effort.

Part II. Selected Examples of problems with Curricular Articulation in the USC system

A. Problems due to changed course description/ numbering

1. At USC-Lancaster the offering of BADM 331, 332, and 334 had to be discontinued when the College of Business Administration at USC-Columbia renumbered the courses as 431, 434, and 432. System impact of the change presumably was not considered.
2. The alteration of the calculus I and II courses at USC-Coastal to three rather than the four hours MATH 141 and 142 earn at Columbia and other campuses creates problems for students changing campuses.
3. Computer science course descriptions at USC-Spartanburg differ from those for identically-numbered courses at USC-Columbia. This creates difficulties in advisement of students planning to change campuses from Union to Spartanburg.
4. Spartanburg has generated new history courses not in the USC-Columbia catalogue. This stresses the capacity of USC-Union to offer sufficient variety of courses to support student campus change options both to Columbia and to Spartanburg.

B. Problems due to different prerequisites/ requirements in same major on different campuses.

1. The College of Business Administration at Columbia requires BADM 290; the Aiken program

will not accept this course. Since the Aiken business major is offered on the Sumter campus, this difference reduces student flexibility in forcing an early decision on which Business major to pursue.

- C. Refusal of academic officers at some four-year campuses to accept legitimate USC courses taught at University Campuses for major credit.
 - 1. Education majors changing campuses from USC-Union to USC-Spartanburg have experienced inconsistent and apparently arbitrary judgements regarding applicability of course work at Union toward the Education degree at Spartanburg. This undermining of student confidence in USC-Union courses is damaging enrollment at USC-Union.
- D. Problems arising from the practice of having the credentials of faculty approved by the appropriate USC-Columbia department in order to teach courses on University Campuses.
 - 1. USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Sumter have been denied the opportunity to offer Criminal Justice courses by denial of permission for qualified faculty to teach these courses.

Part III. Conclusion

It is the hope of this committee that the University of South Carolina will continue to seek ways to harmonize traditional faculty prerogatives with the System concept to which we aspire.

In regard to item 2, Professor Costello of Sumter was reelected committee chair.

In regard to item 3, the committee submits a motion outlining a Visiting Scholars Program.

Visiting Scholars Program

Each campus is requested to submit a list of interested professors with their field(s) of expertise to the Office of the Chancellor for University Campuses and Continuing Education. This office would forward the collated lists to the individual campuses for consideration. Each participant would be contacted in a timely manner. The campuses involved and the invited speakers can arrange the length of the visit and necessary travel and lodging considerations. The visiting scholars would give lectures/presentations in

their own specialty(ies)--either as part of regularly scheduled courses or as guest speakers for the general student body.

In regard to item 4, the Intra-University Services and Communications Committee supports the concept of a uniform University Campuses core curriculum and recommends that each Faculty Organization participate in the study of this issue.

In regard to item 5, a specific motion is presented proposing a procedure for generating new courses and guidelines for use of the UCAM designator. Professor Macias will present the motion.

Motion from the IUSC Committee (Sal Macias)

To the charge that the IUSC Committee review guidelines for the creation of new courses and the use of the UCAM designator, the committee makes the following motion:

1. Requests from a campus for new courses will be submitted to the IUSC Committee with:
 - a. the approval of the appropriate campus committee(s), the faculty organization, and administrators;
 - b. appropriate documentation to include relevant committee notes, letters of support and/or non-support; a rationale and syllabus for the course, who will teach it and his/her credentials, information about relevant costs and availability of institutional support.
2. The IUSC Committee will either:
 - a. disapprove the course, or
 - b. for developmental courses, approve with a UCAM designator, or
 - c. approve for submitting to the appropriate degree-granting department/school.
3. If a course, submitted to a degree-granting institution, is disapproved by that institution, the IUSC Committee will suggest a regular departmental designator and appropriate number assignment for inclusion into the University Campuses Catalog.

4. All such courses approved by the IUSC Committee will be submitted to the University Campuses Faculty Senate for consideration.

Discussion followed the IUSC report.

Dr. Duffy asked whether the committee wanted his Office to disseminate the articulation report to the President, Provost, and Chancellors. The answer was "yes."

Professor Labyak asked if there were recommendations as to how the expenses of the visiting scholar's program would be handled.

Professor Costello stated that the committee had no specific recommendations but hoped that such details would be dealt with by the Chancellor's Office and the two campuses involved in the exchange.

Dr. Duffy stated that his office will make all efforts to support the program.

The chair called for a vote on the Visiting Scholars Program motion, and the motion passed.

Professor Macias noted that it is the recommendation that the UCAM designator be limited to developmental courses. The concerns articulated a year ago about the UCAM designator were that the proliferation of UCAM courses would reinforce the attitude that we are junior level, tech school, remedial colleges. It is true that we offer such courses and we should: that is part of our charge and we shouldn't apologize for that. At the same time, we don't wish to reinforce that that is all we do. All new courses should not be called UCAM, only those that are developmental.

There was no further discussion and the motion passed.

V. Executive Committee - Professor Deborah Cureton (Lancaster)

Professor Cureton reported that the Executive Committee met on April 1, 1988 and discussed issues already acted upon during Standing Committee reports or discussed in Vice Chancellor Gardner's report. The Executive Committee congratulated Dr. Duffy and Professor Gardner for their promotions to Chancellor and Vice Chancellor, respectively.

On December 5, 1987, Professor Graham Tomlinson (Beaufort), who was to have been a member of the Senate died. Professor Gardner requested the following tribute be read.

Graham Tomlinson, my friend and colleague, died of brain cancer on December 5, 1987. He discovered his cancer just

after beginning his first semester at the University of South Carolina-Beaufort. He was excited about continuing his teaching and research in this wonderful community.

One of the pleasures of knowing Graham was his enthusiasm and energy for life. As he often noted, he wanted to be known as a person who took seriously, professionally and personally, the pleasures of living. He barely missed an opportunity to explore and attempt to comprehend his own experiences. I doubt that any of his many students, colleagues, friends and acquaintances who contacted and visited him during his last months would take issue with the observation that he even used his time of dying to celebrate life. None of us would have expected anything less from him.

He rarely found any good reason to separate his life from his work. Since the beginning of our friendship some twenty years ago he was committed to his own form of symbolic interactionism which combined some ideas of Garfinkel, Blumer, Goffman, Bateson, Mead and Dewey. He treated their ideas, as they should be treated, in a pragmatic, rather than a doctrinaire manner. He wanted to know if they had anything to offer him toward a solution to his problems. He found, as I do, more often than not their ideas were useful and, with proper comprehension, revolutionary.

His earlier work used Goffman's vocabulary to examine behavior on public buses. Symbolic interactionism was embedded in his teaching of deviance and mental health. He developed ideas when he taught a wide range of courses in Europe. His humor research gave him an opportunity to do conversational analysis with video recordings. Food was his most recent object of study. Positivism and operationalism were foreign to his character and experience. Herbert Blumer would have been proud of his deep commitment to naturalistic research.

I think often of our conversations about the sad state of sociology and social psychology. We would lament that other symbolic interactionists, most notably, Herbert Blumer, were unable to convince the heirs of Ogburn and Lundberg to abandon their positivism and systematic empiricism for pragmatism and science. But as time went on we began to comprehend the enormity of this task.

The combined tenets of the Enlightenment and the "quest for certainty" along with an interest in being "bookkeepers of facts" are overwhelming. When this rhetoric is mixed with a consumed indifference for practical social life and simple minded psychological "theories," a doctrine is constituted that nothing less than a revolution will change.

Our last conversation was at his favorite place in Beaufort overlooking the marshes and the old bridge on a warm sunny day. We talked about the state of the discipline. I think we agreed that rather than continue to expose, through criticism, the folly of the pseudoscientific "social sciences", that simply ignoring them and proceeding pragmatically to develop and propose solutions to real problems that real people are encountering everyday, as the real sciences do, would best serve our purpose. It would have been a real joy to engage in this adventure together.

Life is a narrative. This is efficient when someone can never appear again as a living form. Henceforth, the friends, colleagues, students, and faculty of Graham will live with him in the telling of many stories. Stories are the legacy of us all.

Charles W. Tucker
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina

Professor Cureton announced that the results of the Executive Committee's developmental questionnaire will be available to the campuses in late summer.

The Executive Committee moved that the two following resolutions be accepted by acclamation:

WHEREAS Dr. Francis T. Borkowski has served the University of South Carolina with distinction as Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost during the past ten years, and

WHEREAS he has strongly supported the system approach to higher education in South Carolina and the expanded role of University Campuses in the USC System, and

WHEREAS Dr. Borkowski has shown an affection for the University Campuses and an appreciation of their special mission,

BE IT RESOLVED that the University Campuses Faculty Senate gratefully acknowledges Dr. Borkowski's efforts and congratulates him on his appointment as President of the University of South Florida.

Passed by acclamation this 22nd day of April, 1988, at Hilton Head Island, South Carolina.

The motion passed by acclamation.

WHEREAS Robert E. Roberson, by virtue of his extraordinary energy, sincere dedication, professional expertise, and enlightened leadership, developed the Computer Services

Division into a powerful, state-of-the-art, systemwide resource,

AND WHEREAS, because of System Vice President Roberson's direction, help, and advice, each of the University Campuses of the University of South Carolina has greatly increased its computer resources for administration, staff, faculty, and students,

AND WHEREAS, because of System Vice President Roberson's efforts to assist all University Campus personnel in further training, continuing education opportunities, and faculty development programs,

AND WHEREAS, the untimely death of System Vice President Roberson has been a great loss to the University of South Carolina System,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the University Campuses Faculty Senate mourns his passing and acknowledges and applauds the talent, skills, and many contributions of System Vice President Roberson.

Passed by acclamation this 22nd day of April, 1988.

The motion passed by acclamation.

There was no discussion of the Executive Committee report.

VI. Reports of Special Committees

A. Library Committee--Professor Tandy Willis (Union, temporary representative)

Professor Willis reported that the Library Committee has not met since the last Senate meeting. He received an invitation to witness a demonstration of the NOTIS on-line cataloging system. Already committed to an Executive Committee meeting on the demonstration date, Professor Willis was unable to attend. Professor Linda Allman (Lifelong Learning) did attend the demonstration and requested that Professor Nancy Washington (Lifelong Learning) inform the Senate about the System.

Professor Washington reported that NOTIS (Northwestern On-Line Totally Integrated System) was the system recommended three years ago by a committee charged with studying available systems. This year, it seems likely that Step 12 funding will allow University libraries to begin to automate to NOTIS. The presentation demonstrated the capabilities of NOTIS. The primary goal for instituting an integrated, on-line system is to make all holdings available on all campuses. The NOTIS system is attractive in that there are continuous efforts to enhance the system. One future

prospect is the ability to integrate the on-line catalogue data base with indexing data bases.

At this time, the libraries are gathering archive tapes of their holdings to be sent to NOTIS to be analyzed to determine how long it will take to get them into the data base to be able to bring up the catalogue. Professor Washington announced that she has printed information on the services and would be happy to share that with anyone interested.

There were no further questions.

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

Professor Castleberry provided the following report:

1. The committee has met a number of times since our last University Campuses Senate meeting. The Columbia Senate has already finalized some of the curricula decisions and it will meet again in May.
2. Almost all of the colleges and schools have altered their programs and are now in compliance with the University core curriculum. Most recently, the BADM program has specified its "Numerical and Analytical reasoning" component to include Math 122 and another course from the accepted list of course (i.e. Phil 110, Math 170, etc.)
3. The faculty are encouraged to carefully review the new college bulletin when it comes out--the program changes will be noted then.
4. I have been sending a listing of important changes to the curricula to the Academic Officers of each University Campus with the understanding that this information would then be brought to the attention of appropriate faculty. I also would like to remind the Academic Officers that I need an Academic Course Schedule from each University Campus for each semester. If you haven't already forwarded me a copy of your schedule, please do so at your earliest convenience.

There were no questions for Professor Castleberry.

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

Professor Zeidan was not in attendance. There was no report.

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

Professor Group was not in attendance; however, the Academic Planning Committee has not met since the February meeting of the Senate.

E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee--
Professor Billy Cordray (Beaufort)

Professor Cordray reported that the Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee met with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees prior to the full Board meeting at Aiken on April 14. The committees approved a request from the College of Applied Professional Sciences for the expansion of its office administration program to include automated information systems as an optional area of specialization. Additionally, personnel matters of a confidential nature were discussed.

During the full meeting of the Board of Trustees, the request from the College of Applied Professional Sciences was unanimously approved.

There were no questions for Professor Cordray.

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

Professor Bohonak reported the approval of \$15,000 in research requests. Projects included the study of salt marshes, oysters, and geological studies. No applications were received from University Campuses.

There were no questions for Professor Bohonak.

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

Professor Willis reported attending two System meetings. On March 16, several issues were addressed. Vice President Denton reported on the budget. A committee chaired by Chancellor Robert Alexander (Aiken) is currently gathering information on the Savannah River Plant and the Savannah River Laboratory. The deadlines were announced for submitting off-campus programs to the President, Board of Trustees, and the Commission on Higher Education for approval.

The Year of the Arts activities were mentioned and all campuses were encouraged to continue such activities. Acting Provost Chester Bain reported on The Cutting Edge. (At that time, document was being discussed in the legislature.) Professor Bain was concerned about regulations regarding out-of-state student enrollment and out-of-state tuition.

On April 20, Johnny Gregory reported on the status of formula funding--93.2%, and announced that The Cutting Edge had been reported out of the Senate Education Committee with some changes in the language. Changes involved the proportion of in-state to out-of-state students. He also mentioned little change in the status of the technical schools' efforts to offer college parallel courses. Dave Rinker reported on the joint bond bill. President Holderman announced the following administrative changes. Professor Kenneth Toombs was reassigned from Director of Libraries to Director of Special Collections and Development. Professor George Terry was assigned to the position of Vice-President for Collections and Libraries (formerly called Director of Libraries). Acting Provost Chester Bain will become the Executive Director of the Byrnes International Center when the search for Provost is successful. Professor Johnny McFadden has been named to the Benjamin Mays Chair in the education department. Tom Step's title has been changed to Senior Vice-President for Development and Cultural Relations. Dr. Duffy's and Professor Gardner's titles have been changed to Chancellor and Vice Chancellor (respectively) for University Campuses and Continuing Education. Vice President for Security Carl Stokes reported on the newspaper article concerning relations between the USC security force and the local authorities. Johnny Gregory mentioned the intent to plan "get-togethers" across the state for USC personnel and state legislators.

There were no questions for Professor Willis.

VII. Special Orders

Election of 1988-89 University Campuses Faculty Senate Officers and Special Committee Representatives

Chairman Willis opened the floor for further nominations for Senate offices. There were three nominations for Senate representative to the Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee.

Professor Sommers Miller (Beaufort) was nominated by Professor Logue (Sumter), seconded by Professor McCollum (Beaufort). Professor Billy Cordray (Beaufort) was nominated by Professor Macias (Sumter), seconded by Professor Walker (Union). Professor Jordan Johnson (Sumter) was nominated by Professor Costello (Sumter), seconded by Professor Bohonak (Lancaster). The nominations were closed with those three names.

Professors Walker and Dockery asked if all nominees were tenured (Professor Johnson does not have tenure) and wondered, in light of changes proposed by the Rights and Responsibilities Committee, if non-tenure of that representative presents a potential problem. That issue was not discussed further.

The Chair announced that voting would be by secret ballot. The first ballot produced no candidate receiving a majority of the votes. According to the University Campuses Faculty Senate By-Laws, there must be a run-off between the two highest vote-getters; however, there was a tie for second place.

Professor Boulware asked for the vote count. The candidates agreed. Professor Miller received 13 votes; Professors Cordray and Johnson each received 7 votes.

The Chair called for a re-vote by secret ballot. Professor Miller received the nomination as Senate representative to the Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee.

Professor Upshaw moved to accept the slate of nominees. That motion was seconded and the Senate voted to accept the slate.

Professor Dockery moved to remove from office, for lack of performance, the Senate representative to the Faculty Welfare Committee. Professor Miller seconded that motion.

Professor Powers, on point of order, stated that there are no provisions/procedures for removing an elected representative from office.

Professor Nims (Lancaster) asked if there is a procedure for ,censure.

Chairman Willis stated that there are no procedures for punitive measures.

The Chair spoke against the motion made by Professor Dockery and asked that the Executive Committee be given the time to handle the concern that the representative does not bring or send reports to the Senate meetings even though the representative may attend the assigned committee meetings. Professor Costello supported the position of the Chair.

Professor Powers objected to the consideration of the motion. The motion not to consider Professor Dockery's motion was passed.

VIII. Unfinished Business

The Senate passed the Nominating Committee guidelines proposed at the February meeting in Lancaster. (See University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, February 19, 1988, pps. 13-14.)

IX. New Business

There was none.

X. Announcements

On behalf of the University faculty and the Office of University Campuses and Continuing Education, Dr. Duffy presented to Chairman Willis a plaque in recognition of Professor Willis's distinguished service as Chair of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, University of South Carolina, 1987-88.

Dr. Duffy announced also that Professor Willis, of the six campus nominees, achieved the honor of receiving the Amoco Teacher of the Year Award.

Chairman Willis expressed his appreciation for having had the experience to serve as Chair of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, then performed his last official act. He passed the gavel to the 1988-89 chairperson, Professor Greg Labyak, who adjourned the last meeting of the 1987-88 academic year.

ATTENDANCE: April 22, 1988

BEAUFORT

Present

Rick Boulware	Executive
Dave McCollum	IUSC
Somers Miller	Welfare
Jane Upshaw	R & R
John Blair	

LANCASTER

Present

Noni Bohonak	Welfare
Deborah Cureton	Executive
Shari Lohela	IUSC
Wayne Thurman	IUSC
Wade Chittam	Welfare
Bruce Nims	(new)
John Catalano	(new)

Absent

Jerry Currence	R&R
Darlene McManus	R&R

LIFELONG LEARNING

Present

Nancy Washington	R&R
Doris Geoghegan	(alternate)
Jerry Dockery	(alternate)

Absent

Linda Allman	Executive
Steve Dalton	IUSC
John Stine	Welfare

SALKEHATCHIE

Present

Greg Labyak	Executive
Marion Preacher	R&R
Ali Pyarali	Welfare
Paul Stone	IUSC
Milton Harden	(new)

SUMTER

Present

Robert Costello	IUSC
Don Curlovic	Welfare
Jean Hatcher	R&R
Jordan Johnson	IUSC
Sal Macias	IUSC
Kay Oldhouser	Welfare
Tom Powers	Executive
Carolyn West	R&R
Pete Maness	(alternate)
John Logue	(alternate R&R)
Robert Castleberry	(alternate IUSC)

Absent

John Varner	Welfare
-------------	---------

UNION

Present

Mary Barton	Welfare
Charles Walker	R&R
Tandy Willis	Executive
Allan Charles	(alternate)

Absent

Julie Fielder	
---------------	--

REPORT OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
USC-Beaufort at Hilton Head
April 22, 1988

I regret that this written report is the only communication you will receive from me at the April 1988 University Campuses Faculty Senate meeting. Thirteen months ago, on behalf of the Freshman Year Experience conference series, I negotiated a contract with a hotel in White Plains, NY at which we are hosting a meeting, April 21-23, 1988. I selected that date because I had felt reasonably confident that there would be no conflict with the University Campuses Faculty Senate meeting which normally meets prior to that each year in April. Alas, not being a sports fan and not dreaming for a minute of the problem that the Heritage Golf Classic posed in terms of our being able to get hotel accommodations the previous week, I could not have foreseen this conflict. I regret very much that I'm not with my partner, the System Vice President, and all of my colleagues in the Faculty Senate for what I am sure will be your usual productive and stimulating discussions, not to mention the great socializing. Vice President Duffy will elaborate of course on any of the items I may discuss below.

Drug Testing

In light of the University's recent problems with drug testing of athletes at USC-Columbia, the President has directed that any and all System Campuses which have intercollegiate athletic programs look into the matter of appropriate drug testing for student athletes and confer with appropriate members of the President's Task Force on this subject as well as personnel in USC's School of Medicine. In turn, this lead the Vice President and me to decide to undertake a thorough view of the student athletic program at USC-Salkehatchie, and, in general, to caution other University Campuses before embarking on any expanded program in intercollegiate athletics. The issues of liability as well as implications for providing adequate student support services for students whose home of record may not be the original county service area of a particular University Campus are indeed enormous. We will be further reviewing this matter between now and the next meeting of the University Campuses Faculty Senate and we will report to you on this subject in September of 1988.

Status of Off-Campus Programs

You will recall that Vice President Duffy and I have spoken to and with you at numerous previous meetings about the matter of the pending CHE review of our off-campus programs (affectionately known as the "Twigs"). It is now a matter of central administration policy that all campuses of the University System will submit simultaneously as one package for review their off-campus programs.

John Gardner's Remarks to Senate
April 22, 1988
Page 2

This will be routed through internal University governance channels for submission to the Board of Trustees at its July 1988 meeting and then forwarded on to CHE. We are hopeful that this will be a routine matter and that CHE approval will be forthcoming without complications. This will be a matter that the University will treat as a highest priority for achieving our desired ends. Each of your campuses currently then is involved in the preparation and writing an appropriate proposal. For further information on the status of your campus's own proposal you should contact your Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Innovative South Carolina State College/USC-Salkehatchie Proposal

Some of you may not be aware, but one of our own campuses, USC-Salkehatchie, is currently attempting to make a type of South Carolina educational history. Specifically, USC-Salkehatchie will be the first state college or university institution to propose a cooperative joint degree venture with the historically black college, South Carolina State College. These two institutions are currently designing a proposal which will go forward to CHE to enable the South Carolina State College Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice to be made available to students at USC-Salkehatchie. For further information you should direct questions at the Senate meeting to Dean Clayton who has been very active in the development of this innovative proposal as have Associate Deans Killion and Brewer. When this proposal comes to fruition, it will be another example of how the University Campuses truly personify the President's vision of the "Learning Center" concept.

Peer Institution Salary Study

As we did several years ago, this Office has recently provided the University's Budget Office with "peer institution" salary data for other less-than-baccalaureate level campuses in multi-campus public education systems. Credit goes to Dr. Milton Baker for the work done on this study. It is our hope that once again we will be able to persuade the Commission on Higher Education to raise the amount in the formula allocated for faculty salaries based on this study of faculty salaries at comparable institutions. Copies of the particulars of this information have been provided to the University Campuses Faculty Senate Chair and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee.

Status of Release of Salary Information to the Welfare Committee

Even though this Office released in excruciating detail, in accordance with the new FOI legislation, in salary ranges of \$4000, the salary of every unclassified academic employee earning less than \$50,000 on all five campuses, we have been informed by the Chair

of the University Campuses Welfare Committee that this was not the information requested and that it is not sufficient. Instead, we have been pursuing the release of information requested by action of the Senate at its April 1987 meeting and reiterated by me in a letter in late August to the University System Vice President for Personnel. This office has now obtained the requested information which lists in descending order the salaries of all University Campuses faculty differentiating 11- and 12-month appointments from the 9-month appointments. It is the desire, intent, and policy of this Office to scrupulously abide by the FOI legislation while simultaneously protecting what little privacy is left to individuals. Consequently it is the decision of this Office not to release the information which reveals salary information as requested differentiating 11- and 12-month appointments from the 9-month appointments, by campus. This would enable determination of individual salaries by attribution. Instead, after the data is verified for accuracy and any statistical anomalies are resolved, the data will be released in composite format combining all five Campuses. Vice President Duffy, his Executive Assistant and Business Manager, Mary Derrick, will have more information on this for you at the Senate meeting.

Review of Grievance Procedures and Procedures for Termination of Tenured Faculty

This Office has attempted to be of service to the University Campuses Faculty Senate Rights and Responsibilities Committee in making recommendations as to problems encountered during the past year when either our faculty have sought to file a grievance according to the grievance procedures in the Faculty Manual and/or the instance when the University administration took action to terminate a tenured faculty appointment. The University Campuses Faculty Senate Welfare Committee has had several meetings on the matter, has considered my written thoughts and sentiments about these subjects, and has also met with Associate General Counsel Lyn Hensel. The subcommittee chair, Professor Carolyn West, is the appropriate person to report on the subcommittee disposition of this matter. Suffice it to say that this Office stands ready to work with the Rights and Responsibilities Committee and with the Faculty Senate over the coming year to further strengthen the appropriate procedures of the Faculty Manual and to resolve any continuing difficulties which may remain in these specific passages.

Super Saturday Placement Tests

As you are probably all aware, the University will be implementing a new core curriculum this coming fall which is necessitating placement testing of all students. This testing is in foreign

John Gardner's Remarks to Senate
April 22, 1988
Page 4

languages and mathematics for all students bound to the Columbia curriculum, including University Campuses students. For those students who are bound for Columbia, the University will do placement tests on two Saturdays in May which are now being dubbed "Super Saturday". The testing is being coordinated through the Columbia Office of Institutional Research and can only be executed with the cooperation and assistance of personnel on the University Campuses. Columbia-admitted students throughout the state are being advised as to potential test sites and dates and given the option of choosing where these tests will be taken. Students currently admitted to University Campuses may also take their tests at this time. In some respects, this is an imposition on the time of personnel on University Campuses to participate in this testing program during their normal free Saturdays. But, if we are to be part of the University System, we are inextricably involved in this matter. In addition, increased assessment instruments are the wave of the future as is clearly evident in entry assessment activities in scores of states elsewhere in the nation. Finally, if The Cutting Edge is indeed adopted by the Legislature, it carries stipulations that institutions must move forward to develop individual assessment plans. So in some respects, we haven't seen anything yet! If you have questions about the particulars of the Super Saturday placement tests on your own campus, they should be directed to your Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Needless to say, these officers as well as myself and David Hunter of this Office have been intimately involved with Columbia personnel in the development of these procedures.

Implementation of Core Curriculum

As in the above matter, the University Campuses Academic Deans have participated in discussions with Columbia officials from the departments of Mathematics and Foreign Languages and Literatures to discuss the specifics of implementing the requirements of a new core curriculum on the University Campuses. We are gearing up to be compatible with the changes and the Associate Deans for Academic Affairs will be providing you with appropriate information for advisement and instructional purposes. System faculty meetings are also being held in Foreign Languages (I regret that it is on April 22) and, hopefully, Mathematics in May, to discuss these kinds of future changes.

I hope you have a good meeting. Again, my sincerest regrets about my absence.

Recommendations from Welfare Committee
April 22, 1988

1. Salary Studies

A. Each campus gives a list (without names) of all salaries of employees with faculty rank. This list would be divided into two parts, one with those faculty with eleven/twelve-month contracts and the other with those faculty with nine-month contracts. Each part would contain the following information on each individual salary:

- i) 1987-88 salary
- ii) the amount of raise based on the percentage increase given to each faculty member who performed his/her assigned duties satisfactorily
- iii) additional merit pay
- iv) amount of low-end adjustment

A suggested format for the two parts of this report (to be completed by each campus) is attached.

B. The salary study that has been generated in the past should be continued for the academic year 1988-89.

C. All salary information provided by Milt Baker via John Gardner to the Welfare Committee which was provided by the System Office of Institutional Research should be given to the Welfare Committee for 1988-89 salaries.

2. Recommendations for salary increases

A. A substantial part of the money available for merit increases should be used to give an across-the-board percentage merit raise for all faculty performing their assigned duties satisfactorily. As a minimum, this percentage increase should be equal to the percentage increase that is given to all classified state employees.

Additional merit should be awarded on the basis of outstanding contribution to the institution, and should only be awarded in cases in which a person has clearly contributed beyond what most faculty have done.

B. Particular attention should be given to length of service and total years of experience with regard to low-end adjustments. As a model for these low-end adjustments, local school district salary schedules should be used so that, as a minimum, a faculty member's salary would be that of a primary or secondary teacher's salary based on years of experience and educational level.

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

APRIL 22, 1988

USC-BEAUFORT AT HILTON HEAD

Informal Session

Chairman Tandy Willis welcomed the Senate delegation and thanked USC-Beaufort for hosting our meeting on Hilton Head Island. The Chairman opened the morning session by asking for remarks from the Deans.

Dean Tuttle (Beaufort) welcomed the group to Hilton Head Island. He reported that things are proceeding well for the Beaufort and Hilton Head campuses. He noted the help and work of state Senator Waddell to establish a permanent campus at Hilton Head and to establish a Coastal Zone Education Center which conducts marine science education programs for grades five through twelve, graduate studies, and continuing education programs. That facility will open beside the Waddell Mariculture Center.

Dean Arnold (Lancaster) did not attend.

Dean May (Lifelong Learning) reported a successful faculty retreat at the Baruch Institute and expected a good ending to the semester. He announced the Adult Learner Conference, May 23, 1988, and invited those interested in attending to contact his office.

Dean Clayton (Salkehatchie) reported an excellent year, including a 20% enrollment increase. Faculty are currently involved in five searches for new or replacement faculty. Walterboro continues to grow and renovation of the main classroom building is in progress. The campus is optimistic that the legislature will fund a new library.

Dean Anderson (Sumter) reported a number of activities. The campus has revamped its computer system, replacing Burrows computers with IBM and IBM compatible equipment. Relationships with Sumter County School District II are being strengthened through the Academic Center by providing more college credit courses to high school students. Physical changes to the campus include revamping the older buildings and adding a second floor to the administration building. The campus is optimistic about the success of a \$4.3 million request to the legislature for a library addition. A library staff and faculty committee are pursuing a Title III grant that will enable the campus to develop a joint coordination project linking the campus library with the Sumter Tech and Sumter County libraries. The campus is beginning a \$250,000 foundation campaign. A task force study on recruitment recently has been

completed and the campus is implementing some of the resulting recommendations. Sumter hosted the Second Annual Carolina Five Tournament, a fun day of activities that involved four of the five University Campuses.

Dean Davis (Union) stated a continued concern about enrollment. A faculty/staff/student retention and recruitment activity study committee studied the situation during the spring for ways to enhance retention of traditional students. Their report will be ready in May and the campus will implement appropriate recommendations. Union will hold its first Honors Convocation on May 1 to recognize Dean's List and President's List students and incoming scholarship recipients. Coach Willie Jeffries will be the speaker, thanks to a mid-year desegregation grant. Mr. Jeffries was formerly head football coach at South Carolina State College; the first black coach of a major white university, Wichita State; and is now head coach at Howard University, Washington, DC. He is also a native of Union, SC. Commencement exercises this year will mark the first official use of the nearly completed central building. Dean Davis announced that Professor Tandy Willis, Chair, University Campuses Faculty Senate, was chosen USC-Union's Teacher of the Year.

Professor Gregory Labyak (Salkehatchie), chairman of the Nominating Committee, reported that the committee met on March 25, 1988, and selected the following nominees:

Executive Committee

Vice Chair	Deborah Cureton (Lancaster)
Secretary	Nancy Washington (Lifelong Learning)
Member At-Large	Rick Boulware
Member At-Large	Carolyn West (Sumter)

According to the University Campuses Faculty Manual, the positions of Chair and Immediate Past Chair are filled by succession; therefore, Greg Labyak is to serve as Chair and Tandy Willis as Immediate Past Chair for 1988-89.

Special Committees

University Library Committee	John Catalano (Lancaster) John Stine (Lifelong Learning) recommended as alternate
Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee	no nominee
Research and Productive Scholarship Committee	Noni Bohonak (Lancaster)

Curricula and Courses Committee (three-year term)
Robert Castleberry
(Sumter)

Academic Forward Planning Committee (three-year term)
Bruce Nims (Lancaster)

Hussein Zeidan (Salkehatchie) will continue his three-year term on the Faculty Welfare Committee, and the Chair of the Senate represents the University Campuses Faculty Senate on the System Committee.

Professor Labyak made the following recommendations on behalf of the Nominating Committee:

The Nominating Committee, recognizing the special importance of University Campuses representation on the Library Committee, in light of recent difficulties (the removal of our representative for a period of several months, then reinstatement), recommends John Stine as an alternate representative to that body. This recommendation helps to insure that we are represented at all meetings of the Library Committee. Recognizing that the chair has power to designate an alternate, the Committee felt it beneficial in this case to officially designate an alternate in this manner, someone known to be committed to serving in the event that the nominee cannot. In addition, the Committee wishes to stress the importance of having Special Committee representatives regularly attend both meetings of their committees and the University Campuses Faculty Senate, in order to answer questions and respond to concerns that the Senate may have regarding the committee reports.

Professor Labyak announced that further nominations would be taken from the floor during the formal session.

Chairman Willis then introduced the morning speaker: Mr. Charles O'Shields from the University of South Carolina Budget Office. Mr. O'Shields thanked the Senate for their warmth and hospitality. He spoke to the group about the process by which the state appropriates money.

The Board of Economic Advisors begins the process by appraising the state's economic outlook. Revenue estimates tend to be conservative. Once an economic forecast is done, an appropriation formula is used to distribute money for higher education. The formula is heavily student driven. The full time equivalent student factor is significant in determining the amount of money.

First the number of FTE faculty needed for each discipline must be computed, based on the number of FTE students in the given discipline according to the student faculty ratio. Then FTE faculty is multiplied by a peer group faculty salary average.

Once salary costs are determined for each discipline, the instructional support percentages must be determined. Salaries plus support costs equal total cost of instruction.

Then 25% of the previous year's research and public service costs is computed.

Academic support libraries receive a factor of 10% of the total cost of instruction.

Academic support--other, an umbrella category, is 12% of the research and public service cost.

Funding for student service activities is computed thusly: \$150.00 for the first 4000 (head-count) students, \$125.00 for the second, \$100.00 for the third, and \$75.00 for all others. In addition, \$3.00 per credit hour produced is allowed.

Operation and maintenance of plant is computed on a series of formulas (custodial services formula, building maintenance formula, grounds maintenance formula, actual cost of utilities, etc.). The sum of all these formulas produces the amount for operation and plant maintenance.

Institutional support (such as business office) equals 15% of total of previous sum or \$50,000, whichever is larger.

Unique costs (usually site specific) and state employer contributions become factors.

Once all computations have been totaled, the total is multiplied by 20% and that is the amount the institution must self-generate. Eighty percent of that total is the amount of state funds the formula generates.

It should be understood that full formula funding by the state means providing 80% of the money needed (according to the formula) for institutional functioning.

Full formula funding would be 100% of the 80% of the formula total that the state should provide. The institution must still generate 20% of general needs.

Currently, the legislature is discussing funding higher education at 93% of the formula. Ninety-three percent represents only about 75% of actual need.

When salary increases are mandated, still only 80% is funded by the state. Differences must be internally generated.

Student fees are one means to fill the gap between what is needed and what is provided. Student fees may increase by \$50.00 next year.

Currently the salary package is being discussed at a 4% funding level. It means that the pool of dollars is 4% of the base. A range of increase can be made available, from 0%-8%. Again, extra money must be internally generated.

Mr. O'Shields concluded that there is optimism that state funding will look considerably better for higher education this year than last year.

Professor Costello (Sumter) asked if the 80% funding by the state applied to staff as well as faculty. Mr. O'Shields said it does. However, staff raises are subject to a different plan. Staff raises are normally subject to ranges.

Professor Costello asked what kind of a correlation is there between the dollars generated by the formula and what is actually used in an operating budget? Mr. O'Shields stated that President Holderman maintains that if full-formula funding is consistent, then the University can progress. However in previous years funding has fallen, presenting difficulties.

Professor Costello rephrased his question to ask whether money earmarked for salaries, for example, can be used for other purposes. Mr. O'Shields answered that the University is considered a "lump-sum" agency. However, the wage package almost always exceeds the amount calculated for it. Differences come from some other category such as maintenance.

Dean Davis (Union) asked if Mr. O'Shield's office is responsible for providing the factors used by the CHE formula. Mr. O'Shields stated that the institution provides the information and Pete Denton coordinates and compiles the information generated.

Dean Davis then asked if funds acquired through grants would have a positive impact on the public service component of the formula in the following year. Mr. O'Shields said it would.

Dean May (Lifelong Learning) remarked that the 25% is actually a 20% pay-out.

Mr. O'Shields concurred. He noted too that a 2% mid-year budget cut is actually a 4% cut, because the 2% is computed on an annual amount.

There were no more questions and Mr. O'Shields thanked the Senate for the opportunity to meet with them.

Chairman Willis then reminded the Standing Committee members to elect new chairpersons for the following year and adjourned the Senate to Standing Committee meetings.

GENERAL SESSION

I. Call to Order

Chairman Willis called the formal session to order and reminded the membership to identify themselves when speaking and to provide written committee reports to the secretary.

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes

The chair asked for corrections to the minutes of the Senate meeting held at USC-Lancaster on February 19, 1988. Hearing none, he requested and received motion and second to approve those minutes.

Before receiving reports from University Officers, Chairman Willis asked newly elected Senators to introduce themselves. Presenting themselves to the Senate were Professors Milton Harden (Salkehatchie), Bruce Nims (Lancaster), John Logue (Sumter), and Robert Castleberry (Sumter). Professor John Catalano (Lancaster) had been present during the morning session but was unable to remain during the afternoon.

III. Reports from University Officers

A. Dr. John J. Duffy, Chancellor for University Campuses and Continuing Education

Dr. Duffy announced that three important searches are currently in progress: for Provost, for Vice-President of Computer Affairs, and for Dean of Education. He reported on the progress of the Provost search. The search committee for the Provost has invited nine candidates, from a pool of approximately one hundred and seventy, to come to Columbia. On Monday, the group will be reduced to four or five. Dr. Duffy agreed to answer questions about the information provided by Mr. O'Shields during the morning session and about Professor Gardner's report. There were no questions.

B. Professor John N. Gardner, Vice Chancellor for University Campuses and Continuing Education

Professor Gardner, though unable to attend, provided a written report. See Attachment 1.

IV. Reports from Standing Committees

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

Professor Walker moved that the Senate approve the revision of letters that are to be sent to tenure and promotion applicants. (See original wording of letters in University Campus Senate Minutes, April 24, 1987, p. 19).

Revised Tenure and Promotion Letters

- A. The University campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee met on (Date) and recommends you for (promotion to _____ and/or tenure). This recommendation has not been reviewed by the Administration of the University. This decision is not final until the Administration's and Committee's recommendations are acted on by the Board of Trustees.
- B. The University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee met on (date) and has recommended you for _____; however, the Committee has not recommended you for _____ at this time. These recommendations have not been reviewed by the Administration of the University. These decisions are not final until the Administration's and the Committee's recommendations are acted on by the Board of Trustees.

If you wish to appeal the Committee's action with regard to _____ you may do so by letter to me, through the Office of the Chancellor as outlined in the University Campuses Faculty Manual.

- C. The University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee met on (date) and does not recommend you for (promotion to _____ and/or tenure). This recommendation has not been reviewed by the Administration of the University. This decision is not final until the Administration's and the Committee's recommendations are acted on by the Board of Trustees.

If you wish to appeal the Committee's action with regard to _____, you may do so by letter to me, through the Office of the Chancellor as outlined in the University Campuses Faculty Manual.

The letters are to be sent by the chairperson of the Tenure and Promotion Committee and they state that the recommendations of the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee are not final--they must be reviewed by the administration of the University and acted upon by the Board of Trustees--and provide a statement of the right to grieve those recommendations.

Chairman Willis stated that a motion from Committee requires no second and asked for discussion. There was no discussion and the motion passed.

Professor Walker reported on a matter discussed in previous Senate meetings: What constitutes a 'simple majority' during the deliberation of the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee? (See University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, February 19, 1987, p. 10). The Committee

moved to delete the sentence, "Votes on all questions will pass by simple majority", from the revised TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES approved April 24, 1987, at USC-Beaufort. (See University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, April 24, 1987, p. 19).

Professor Walker presented the Committee's sentiment that the change will allow each Tenure and Promotion Committee to govern itself on that matter.

There ensued a substantial amount of discussion during which Professors Logue and Willis stated that the deletion of that sentence allows the Committee's recommendation and vote to be forwarded to the next level of review.

Chairman Willis stated that the motion constitutes a change in the manual. Such revisions qualify as a substantial issue, usually brought forth in one meeting and voted upon during the next, unless there is a motion to suspend the rules by a two-thirds vote.

Professor Powers (Sumter), on a point of order, stated that by-laws cannot be suspended by a two-thirds vote. Only rules of order of a meeting can be suspended.

There was discussion of appropriate procedures for handling the motion.

Professor Upshaw (Beaufort), referring to The University Campuses Faculty Manual, page 15, quoted, "The Senate follows Robert's Rules of Order in conducting its business, unless otherwise provided for in the By-laws or the standing rules." She continued that Robert's Rules of Order allows for action on the matter with a two-thirds vote.

Professor Macias substantiated the point.

The Senate voted to suspend the rules and consider the motion of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

The motion to delete the sentence containing "simple majority" was passed.

Professor Walker then called on Professor Carolyn West (Sumter) to deliver a sub-committee report. The sub-committee, chaired by Professor West, met on March 25, 1988. The action taken by the sub-committee was approved during the day's Rights and Responsibilities Committee meeting and brought forward to the Senate. The first motion was to establish a Grievance Committee for the University Campuses. The Rights and Responsibilities Committee moves that a Grievance Committee be established for the University Campuses Faculty to be composed of six members, one from each University Campus and one from Lifelong Learning.

Members will be elected by the campus faculty organization, must be tenured and may be senators. Members may succeed themselves. The Committee shall be elected before the April Faculty Senate meeting and will serve for one year. The committee will elect its own chair at the first Faculty Senate meeting of the year.

Chairman Willis stated that no second was needed and asked for discussion.

Professor Dockery (Lifelong Learning) asked if the Grievance Committee would be a Standing Committee, necessitating an earlier election of a chairperson for that person to attend the retreat and be involved in Senate business. Professor West replied that the Grievance Committee was not intended to be a Standing Committee nor was it intended that Grievance committee members necessarily attend Senate meetings, only the initial meeting in order to elect a chair.

Chairman Willis requested Professor West to provide background information that precipitated the motion. Professor West stated that grievance procedures have gone to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee and many members of that committee are non-tenured. The Rights and Responsibilities Committee feels that it may be disadvantageous for a non-tenured member to deal with a grievance.

An option not chosen was to allow only tenured persons to serve on the Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

Professor Thurman (Lancaster) asked how Grievance Committee members would be chosen.

Professor West stated that the members would be elected by each faculty organization.

When discussion ended, Chairman Willis called for the vote, and the motion passed.

Professor West continued the report with a second motion. This motion represents a change in the Faculty Manual. The Faculty Manual currently allows two routes to appeal a notice of termination. One route is cited on page 25 which states that an appeal could be made to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, and the other is cited on page 65 which states that the appeal could be made to the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee. The question arises as to which body has precedence if one chooses to appeal to both. The motion was made to change the wording on page 25 of the Faculty Manual to make it consistent to what is on page 65, allowing one route of appeal--to the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Original wording, p. 25, University Campuses Faculty Manual

Any faculty member whose appointment may be terminated for cause under the provision of this paragraph shall be notified in writing; this notification shall include a detailed statement of the grounds for termination and an explanation of his/her right to a hearing with counsel before the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. A request for hearing must be submitted in writing to the President within fifteen days of the receipt of notification of termination. If the faculty member elects to request a hearing, the effective date of his/her termination shall not be in advance of the final decision of the Executive Committee, although the President shall have the authority in the meantime to suspend the faculty member in question until proceedings have been completed.

Proposed revision:

Any faculty member whose appointment may be terminated for cause under the provision of this paragraph shall be notified in writing; this notification shall include a detailed statement of the grounds for termination and an explanation of his/her right to a hearing with counsel before the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the Board of Trustees. A request for hearing must be submitted in writing to the President within fifteen days of the receipt of notification of termination. If the faculty member elects to request a hearing, the effective date of his/her termination shall not be in advance of the final decision of the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee, although the President shall have the authority in the meantime to suspend the faculty member in question until proceedings have been completed.

The chair asked for discussion. Professor Powers wondered whether the University Campuses' representative to the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee would have to be tenured as a result of this action. Professor West stated that the Committee did not discuss that.

There was no further discussion. The Chair called for the vote and the motion passed.

Professor West continued the report, stating that some grievance issues still needed clarification; however, there was not enough time in this session to deal with them adequately.

She recommended that the issues be carried over by the Rights and Responsibilities Committee into the next session along with information generated about those issues during this session.

Professor Walker then thanked Professor Logue for his invaluable assistance and time as adviser to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee, Dean Anderson for his support, and Professor West for chairing the subcommittee. Professor Walker ended the report of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee by announcing Professor John Logue as the committee chairman for next year.

B. Welfare--Professor Don Curlovic (Sumter)

Professor Curlovic presented a motion from the Welfare committee to the Senate to accept and approve the recommendations for the continuation of the salary study and recommendation for salary increases. (See Attachment 2)

Brought to the Senate's attention was the information in 1.C. (All salary information provided by Milt Baker via John Gardner to the Welfare Committee which was provided by the System Office of Institutional Research should be given to the Welfare Committee for 1988-89 salaries.) and 2.B. (Particular attention should be given to length of service and total years of experience with regard to low-end adjustments. As a model for these low-end adjustments, local school district salary schedules should be used so that, as a minimum, a faculty member's salary would be that of a primary or secondary teacher's salary based on years of experience and educational level.), new information not contained in last year's recommendations.

The motion required no second and the chair called for discussion. Professor Curlovic stated that the format of the requested information would not breach the confidentiality of any one individual since at least six persons on each campus would fall into each category.

There was no further discussion and the motion passed.

Professor Curlovic thanked the Chancellor's Office for all the information generated for and provided to the Welfare Committee. He then asked Dr. Duffy that if a new multiplier were to be used in the funding formula and generated more money for the faculty salary factor, would that money be used for faculty salary.

Dr. Duffy stated that if the state funds a 4% raise, the intention is still to award a salary package ranging from 0-8%. There will also be a request made to the President to allow 3% from operating resources to be added to the salary budget which would allow salaries to range from 0-11% increase. However, salary packages cannot be directly related to the formula. It may be disadvantageous to do so. The University has been paying higher salaries than those indicated by the formula.

Professor Curlovic ended his report by announcing the election of Professor Mary Barton (Union) as chair of the Welfare Committee next year.

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

Professor Costello submitted the following report.

In its meetings on Thursday, April 21 and Friday, April 22 the committee dealt with five issues:

1. A report on curricula articulation within the USC System
2. Selection of a chairman for next year
3. A proposal for a Visiting Scholars Program
4. A preliminary proposal for a uniform University Campuses core curriculum for AA and AS degrees, and
5. Procedure for creating new courses and the use of the UCAM course designator

In regards to item 1, curricular articulation, I shall read our report for insertion into the minutes.

REPORT OF THE INTRA-UNIVERSITY SERVICES AND
COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF
CURRICULAR ARTICULATION WITHIN THE
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA SYSTEM, APRIL, 1988

Part I. Rationale

During the 1987-88 academic year the Intra-University Services and Communication Committee of the University Campuses Faculty Senate has undertaken a survey of the status of curricular articulation within the entire USC System. Nowhere can one find a greater dedication to the smooth function of the system than among the University Campuses. Since none of these campuses currently has baccalaureate degree-granting authority each must be concerned with transferability of credits both to the Columbia campus and to any one of the three smaller baccalaureate degree-granting institutions in the USC System.

Clearly, divergence of course descriptions for basic courses among the Columbia, Aiken, Coastal and Spartanburg campuses represents a major detriment to the University Campuses' effective function, as such divergence either reduces a student's change of campus

options or produces an expensive proliferation of course offering on the University Campuses. An equally frustrating problem for the University Campuses has been the occasional arbitrary refusal of academic officers at four-year institutions to accept course work done on University Campuses for credit in degree programs.

We urge the University to take concrete steps to move rapidly toward the goals articulated in its 2001 Report "...to foster consideration on each campus for the impact that decisions may have on other campuses and on the system." It is our hope that Part II of this report will provide increased motivation for this effort.

Part II. Selected Examples of problems with Curricular Articulation in the USC system

- A. Problems due to changed course description/ numbering
1. At USC-Lancaster the offering of BADM 331, 332, and 334 had to be discontinued when the College of Business Administration at USC-Columbia renumbered the courses as 431, 434, and 432. System impact of the change presumably was not considered.
 2. The alteration of the calculus I and II courses at USC-Coastal to three rather than the four hours MATH 141 and 142 earn at Columbia and other campuses creates problems for students changing campuses.
 3. Computer science course descriptions at USC-Spartanburg differ from those for identically-numbered courses at USC-Columbia. This creates difficulties in advisement of students planning to change campuses from Union to Spartanburg.
 4. Spartanburg has generated new history courses not in the USC-Columbia catalogue. This stresses the capacity of USC-Union to offer sufficient variety of courses to support student campus change options both to Columbia and to Spartanburg.
- B. Problems due to different prerequisites/ requirements in same major on different campuses.
1. The College of Business Administration at Columbia requires BADM 290; the Aiken program

will not accept this course. Since the Aiken business major is offered on the Sumter campus, this difference reduces student flexibility in forcing an early decision on which Business major to pursue.

- C. Refusal of academic officers at some four-year campuses to accept legitimate USC courses taught at University Campuses for major credit.
 - 1. Education majors changing campuses from USC-Union to USC-Spartanburg have experienced inconsistent and apparently arbitrary judgements regarding applicability of course work at Union toward the Education degree at Spartanburg. This undermining of student confidence in USC-Union courses is damaging enrollment at USC-Union.
- D. Problems arising from the practice of having the credentials of faculty approved by the appropriate USC-Columbia department in order to teach courses on University Campuses.
 - 1. USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Sumter have been denied the opportunity to offer Criminal Justice courses by denial of permission for qualified faculty to teach these courses.

Part III. Conclusion

It is the hope of this committee that the University of South Carolina will continue to seek ways to harmonize traditional faculty prerogatives with the System concept to which we aspire.

In regard to item 2, Professor Costello of Sumter was reelected committee chair.

In regard to item 3, the committee submits a motion outlining a Visiting Scholars Program.

Visiting Scholars Program

Each campus is requested to submit a list of interested professors with their field(s) of expertise to the Office of the Chancellor for University Campuses and Continuing Education. This office would forward the collated lists to the individual campuses for consideration. Each participant would be contacted in a timely manner. The campuses involved and the invited speakers can arrange the length of the visit and necessary travel and lodging considerations. The visiting scholars would give lectures/presentations in

their own specialty(ies)--either as part of regularly scheduled courses or as guest speakers for the general student body.

In regard to item 4, the Intra-University Services and Communications Committee supports the concept of a uniform University Campuses core curriculum and recommends that each Faculty Organization participate in the study of this issue.

In regard to item 5, a specific motion is presented proposing a procedure for generating new courses and guidelines for use of the UCAM designator. Professor Macias will present the motion.

Motion from the IUSC Committee (Sal Macias)

To the charge that the IUSC Committee review guidelines for the creation of new courses and the use of the UCAM designator, the committee makes the following motion:

1. Requests from a campus for new courses will be submitted to the IUSC Committee with:
 - a. the approval of the appropriate campus committee(s), the faculty organization, and administrators;
 - b. appropriate documentation to include relevant committee notes, letters of support and/or non-support; a rationale and syllabus for the course, who will teach it and his/her credentials, information about relevant costs and availability of institutional support.
2. The IUSC Committee will either:
 - a. disapprove the course, or
 - b. for developmental courses, approve with a UCAM designator, or
 - c. approve for submitting to the appropriate degree-granting department/school.
3. If a course, submitted to a degree-granting institution, is disapproved by that institution, the IUSC Committee will suggest a regular departmental designator and appropriate number assignment for inclusion into the University Campuses Catalog.

4. All such courses approved by the IUSC Committee will be submitted to the University Campuses Faculty Senate for consideration.

Discussion followed the IUSC report.

Dr. Duffy asked whether the committee wanted his Office to disseminate the articulation report to the President, Provost, and Chancellors. The answer was "yes."

Professor Labyak asked if there were recommendations as to how the expenses of the visiting scholar's program would be handled.

Professor Costello stated that the committee had no specific recommendations but hoped that such details would be dealt with by the Chancellor's Office and the two campuses involved in the exchange.

Dr. Duffy stated that his office will make all efforts to support the program.

The chair called for a vote on the Visiting Scholars Program motion, and the motion passed.

Professor Macias noted that it is the recommendation that the UCAM designator be limited to developmental courses. The concerns articulated a year ago about the UCAM designator were that the proliferation of UCAM courses would reinforce the attitude that we are junior level, tech school, remedial colleges. It is true that we offer such courses and we should: that is part of our charge and we shouldn't apologize for that. At the same time, we don't wish to reinforce that that is all we do. All new courses should not be called UCAM, only those that are developmental.

There was no further discussion and the motion passed.

V. Executive Committee - Professor Deborah Cureton (Lancaster)

Professor Cureton reported that the Executive Committee met on April 1, 1988 and discussed issues already acted upon during Standing Committee reports or discussed in Vice Chancellor Gardner's report. The Executive Committee congratulated Dr. Duffy and Professor Gardner for their promotions to Chancellor and Vice Chancellor, respectively.

On December 5, 1987, Professor Graham Tomlinson (Beaufort), who was to have been a member of the Senate died. Professor Gardner requested the following tribute be read.

Graham Tomlinson, my friend and colleague, died of brain cancer on December 5, 1987. He discovered his cancer just

after beginning his first semester at the University of South Carolina-Beaufort. He was excited about continuing his teaching and research in this wonderful community.

One of the pleasures of knowing Graham was his enthusiasm and energy for life. As he often noted, he wanted to be known as a person who took seriously, professionally and personally, the pleasures of living. He barely missed an opportunity to explore and attempt to comprehend his own experiences. I doubt that any of his many students, colleagues, friends and acquaintances who contacted and visited him during his last months would take issue with the observation that he even used his time of dying to celebrate life. None of us would have expected anything less from him.

He rarely found any good reason to separate his life from his work. Since the beginning of our friendship some twenty years ago he was committed to his own form of symbolic interactionism which combined some ideas of Garfinkel, Blumer, Goffman, Bateson, Mead and Dewey. He treated their ideas, as they should be treated, in a pragmatic, rather than a doctrinaire manner. He wanted to know if they had anything to offer him toward a solution to his problems. He found, as I do, more often than not their ideas were useful and, with proper comprehension, revolutionary.

His earlier work used Goffman's vocabulary to examine behavior on public buses. Symbolic interactionism was embedded in his teaching of deviance and mental health. He developed ideas when he taught a wide range of courses in Europe. His humor research gave him an opportunity to do conversational analysis with video recordings. Food was his most recent object of study. Positivism and operationalism were foreign to his character and experience. Herbert Blumer would have been proud of his deep commitment to naturalistic research.

I think often of our conversations about the sad state of sociology and social psychology. We would lament that other symbolic interactionists, most notably, Herbert Blumer, were unable to convince the heirs of Ogburn and Lundberg to abandon their positivism and systematic empiricism for pragmatism and science. But as time went on we began to comprehend the enormity of this task.

The combined tenets of the Enlightenment and the "quest for certainty" along with an interest in being "bookkeepers of facts" are overwhelming. When this rhetoric is mixed with a consumed indifference for practical social life and simple minded psychological "theories," a doctrine is constituted that nothing less than a revolution will change.

Our last conversation was at his favorite place in Beaufort overlooking the marshes and the old bridge on a warm sunny day. We talked about the state of the discipline. I think we agreed that rather than continue to expose, through criticism, the folly of the pseudoscientific "social sciences", that simply ignoring them and proceeding pragmatically to develop and propose solutions to real problems that real people are encountering everyday, as the real sciences do, would best serve our purpose. It would have been a real joy to engage in this adventure together.

Life is a narrative. This is efficient when someone can never appear again as a living form. Henceforth, the friends, colleagues, students, and faculty of Graham will live with him in the telling of many stories. Stories are the legacy of us all.

Charles W. Tucker
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina

Professor Cureton announced that the results of the Executive Committee's developmental questionnaire will be available to the campuses in late summer.

The Executive Committee moved that the two following resolutions be accepted by acclamation:

WHEREAS Dr. Francis T. Borkowski has served the University of South Carolina with distinction as Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost during the past ten years, and

WHEREAS he has strongly supported the system approach to higher education in South Carolina and the expanded role of University Campuses in the USC System, and

WHEREAS Dr. Borkowski has shown an affection for the University Campuses and an appreciation of their special mission,

BE IT RESOLVED that the University Campuses Faculty Senate gratefully acknowledges Dr. Borkowski's efforts and congratulates him on his appointment as President of the University of South Florida.

Passed by acclamation this 22nd day of April, 1988, at Hilton Head Island, South Carolina.

The motion passed by acclamation.

WHEREAS Robert E. Roberson, by virtue of his extraordinary energy, sincere dedication, professional expertise, and enlightened leadership, developed the Computer Services

Division into a powerful, state-of-the-art, systemwide resource,

AND WHEREAS, because of System Vice President Roberson's direction, help, and advice, each of the University Campuses of the University of South Carolina has greatly increased its computer resources for administration, staff, faculty, and students,

AND WHEREAS, because of System Vice President Roberson's efforts to assist all University Campus personnel in further training, continuing education opportunities, and faculty development programs,

AND WHEREAS, the untimely death of System Vice President Roberson has been a great loss to the University of South Carolina System,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the University Campuses Faculty Senate mourns his passing and acknowledges and applauds the talent, skills, and many contributions of System Vice President Roberson.

Passed by acclamation this 22nd day of April, 1988.

The motion passed by acclamation.

There was no discussion of the Executive Committee report.

VI. Reports of Special Committees

A. Library Committee--Professor Tandy Willis (Union, temporary representative)

Professor Willis reported that the Library Committee has not met since the last Senate meeting. He received an invitation to witness a demonstration of the NOTIS on-line cataloguing system. Already committed to an Executive Committee meeting on the demonstration date, Professor Willis was unable to attend. Professor Linda Allman (Lifelong Learning) did attend the demonstration and requested that Professor Nancy Washington (Lifelong Learning) inform the Senate about the System.

Professor Washington reported that NOTIS (Northwestern On-Line Totally Integrated System) was the system recommended three years ago by a committee charged with studying available systems. This year, it seems likely that Step 12 funding will allow University libraries to begin to automate to NOTIS. The presentation demonstrated the capabilities of NOTIS. The primary goal for instituting an integrated, on-line system is to make all holdings available on all campuses. The NOTIS system is attractive in that there are continuous efforts to enhance the system. One future

prospect is the ability to integrate the on-line catalogue data base with indexing data bases.

At this time, the libraries are gathering archive tapes of their holdings to be sent to NOTIS to be analyzed to determine how long it will take to get them into the data base to be able to bring up the catalogue. Professor Washington announced that she has printed information on the services and would be happy to share that with anyone interested.

There were no further questions.

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

Professor Castleberry provided the following report:

1. The committee has met a number of times since our last University Campuses Senate meeting. The Columbia Senate has already finalized some of the curricula decisions and it will meet again in May.
2. Almost all of the colleges and schools have altered their programs and are now in compliance with the University core curriculum. Most recently, the BADM program has specified its "Numerical and Analytical reasoning" component to include Math 122 and another course from the accepted list of course (i.e. Phil 110, Math 170, etc.)
3. The faculty are encouraged to carefully review the new college bulletin when it comes out--the program changes will be noted then.
4. I have been sending a listing of important changes to the curricula to the Academic Officers of each University Campus with the understanding that this information would then be brought to the attention of appropriate faculty. I also would like to remind the Academic Officers that I need an Academic Course Schedule from each University Campus for each semester. If you haven't already forwarded me a copy of your schedule, please do so at your earliest convenience.

There were no questions for Professor Castleberry.

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

Professor Zeidan was not in attendance. There was no report.

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

Professor Group was not in attendance; however, the Academic Planning Committee has not met since the February meeting of the Senate.

E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee--
Professor Billy Cordray (Beaufort)

Professor Cordray reported that the Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee met with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees prior to the full Board meeting at Aiken on April 14. The committees approved a request from the College of Applied Professional Sciences for the expansion of its office administration program to include automated information systems as an optional area of specialization. Additionally, personnel matters of a confidential nature were discussed.

During the full meeting of the Board of Trustees, the request from the College of Applied Professional Sciences was unanimously approved.

There were no questions for Professor Cordray.

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

Professor Bohonak reported the approval of \$15,000 in research requests. Projects included the study of salt marshes, oysters, and geological studies. No applications were received from University Campuses.

There were no questions for Professor Bohonak.

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

Professor Willis reported attending two System meetings. On March 16, several issues were addressed. Vice President Denton reported on the budget. A committee chaired by Chancellor Robert Alexander (Aiken) is currently gathering information on the Savannah River Plant and the Savannah River Laboratory. The deadlines were announced for submitting off-campus programs to the President, Board of Trustees, and the Commission on Higher Education for approval.

The Year of the Arts activities were mentioned and all campuses were encouraged to continue such activities. Acting Provost Chester Bain reported on The Cutting Edge. (At that time, document was being discussed in the legislature.) Professor Bain was concerned about regulations regarding out-of-state student enrollment and out-of-state tuition.

On April 20, Johnny Gregory reported on the status of formula funding--93.2%, and announced that The Cutting Edge had been reported out of the Senate Education Committee with some changes in the language. Changes involved the proportion of in-state to out-of-state students. He also mentioned little change in the status of the technical schools' efforts to offer college parallel courses. Dave Rinker reported on the joint bond bill. President Holderman announced the following administrative changes. Professor Kenneth Toombs was reassigned from Director of Libraries to Director of Special Collections and Development. Professor George Terry was assigned to the position of Vice-President for Collections and Libraries (formerly called Director of Libraries). Acting Provost Chester Bain will become the Executive Director of the Byrnes International Center when the search for Provost is successful. Professor Johnny McFadden has been named to the Benjamin Mays Chair in the education department. Tom Step's title has been changed to Senior Vice-President for Development and Cultural Relations. Dr. Duffy's and Professor Gardner's titles have been changed to Chancellor and Vice Chancellor (respectively) for University Campuses and Continuing Education. Vice President for Security Carl Stokes reported on the newspaper article concerning relations between the USC security force and the local authorities. Johnny Gregory mentioned the intent to plan "get-togethers" across the state for USC personnel and state legislators.

There were no questions for Professor Willis.

VII. Special Orders

Election of 1988-89 University Campuses Faculty Senate Officers and Special Committee Representatives

Chairman Willis opened the floor for further nominations for Senate offices. There were three nominations for Senate representative to the Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee.

Professor Sommers Miller (Beaufort) was nominated by Professor Logue (Sumter), seconded by Professor McCollum (Beaufort). Professor Billy Cordray (Beaufort) was nominated by Professor Macias (Sumter), seconded by Professor Walker (Union). Professor Jordan Johnson (Sumter) was nominated by Professor Costello (Sumter), seconded by Professor Bohonak (Lancaster). The nominations were closed with those three names.

Professors Walker and Dockery asked if all nominees were tenured (Professor Johnson does not have tenure) and wondered, in light of changes proposed by the Rights and Responsibilities Committee, if non-tenure of that representative presents a potential problem. That issue was not discussed further.

The Chair announced that voting would be by secret ballot. The first ballot produced no candidate receiving a majority of the votes. According to the University Campuses Faculty Senate By-Laws, there must be a run-off between the two highest vote-getters; however, there was a tie for second place.

Professor Boulware asked for the vote count. The candidates agreed. Professor Miller received 13 votes; Professors Cordray and Johnson each received 7 votes.

The Chair called for a re-vote by secret ballot. Professor Miller received the nomination as Senate representative to the Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee.

Professor Upshaw moved to accept the slate of nominees. That motion was seconded and the Senate voted to accept the slate.

Professor Dockery moved to remove from office, for lack of performance, the Senate representative to the Faculty Welfare Committee. Professor Miller seconded that motion.

Professor Powers, on point of order, stated that there are no provisions/procedures for removing an elected representative from office.

Professor Nims (Lancaster) asked if there is a procedure for censure.

Chairman Willis stated that there are no procedures for punitive measures.

The Chair spoke against the motion made by Professor Dockery and asked that the Executive Committee be given the time to handle the concern that the representative does not bring or send reports to the Senate meetings even though the representative may attend the assigned committee meetings. Professor Costello supported the position of the Chair.

Professor Powers objected to the consideration of the motion. The motion not to consider Professor Dockery's motion was passed.

VIII. Unfinished Business

The Senate passed the Nominating Committee guidelines proposed at the February meeting in Lancaster. (See University Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes, February 19, 1988, pps. 13-14.)

IX. New Business

There was none.

X. Announcements

On behalf of the University faculty and the Office of University Campuses and Continuing Education, Dr. Duffy presented to Chairman Willis a plaque in recognition of Professor Willis's distinguished service as Chair of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, University of South Carolina, 1987-88.

Dr. Duffy announced also that Professor Willis, of the six campus nominees, achieved the honor of receiving the Amoco Teacher of the Year Award.

Chairman Willis expressed his appreciation for having had the experience to serve as Chair of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, then performed his last official act. He passed the gavel to the 1988-89 chairperson, Professor Greg Labyak, who adjourned the last meeting of the 1987-88 academic year.

ATTENDANCE: April 22, 1988

BEAUFORT

Present

Rick Boulware	Executive
Dave McCollum	IUSC
Somers Miller	Welfare
Jane Upshaw	R & R
John Blair	

LANCASTER

Present

Noni Bohonak	Welfare
Deborah Cureton	Executive
Shari Lohela	IUSC
Wayne Thurman	IUSC
Wade Chittam	Welfare
Bruce Nims	(new)
John Catalano	(new)

Absent

Jerry Currence	R&R
Darlene McManus	R&R

LIFELONG LEARNING

Present

Nancy Washington	R&R
Doris Geoghegan	(alternate)
Jerry Dockery	(alternate)

Absent

Linda Allman	Executive
Steve Dalton	IUSC
John Stine	Welfare

SALKEHATCHIE

Present

Greg Labyak	Executive
Marion Preacher	R&R
Ali Pyarali	Welfare
Paul Stone	IUSC
Milton Harden	(new)

SUMTER

Present

Robert Costello	IUSC
Don Curlovic	Welfare
Jean Hatcher	R&R
Jordan Johnson	IUSC
Sal Macias	IUSC
Kay Oldhouser	Welfare
Tom Powers	Executive
Carolyn West	R&R
Pete Maness	(alternate)
John Logue	(alternate R&R)
Robert Castleberry	(alternate IUSC)

Absent

John Varner	Welfare
-------------	---------

UNION

Present

Mary Barton	Welfare
Charles Walker	R&R
Tandy Willis	Executive
Allan Charles	(alternate)

Absent

Julie Fielder	
---------------	--

REPORT OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
USC-Beaufort at Hilton Head
April 22, 1988

I regret that this written report is the only communication you will receive from me at the April 1988 University Campuses Faculty Senate meeting. Thirteen months ago, on behalf of the Freshman Year Experience conference series, I negotiated a contract with a hotel in White Plains, NY at which we are hosting a meeting, April 21-23, 1988. I selected that date because I had felt reasonably confident that there would be no conflict with the University Campuses Faculty Senate meeting which normally meets prior to that each year in April. Alas, not being a sports fan and not dreaming for a minute of the problem that the Heritage Golf Classic posed in terms of our being able to get hotel accommodations the previous week, I could not have foreseen this conflict. I regret very much that I'm not with my partner, the System Vice President, and all of my colleagues in the Faculty Senate for what I am sure will be your usual productive and stimulating discussions, not to mention the great socializing. Vice President Duffy will elaborate of course on any of the items I may discuss below.

Drug Testing

In light of the University's recent problems with drug testing of athletes at USC-Columbia, the President has directed that any and all System Campuses which have intercollegiate athletic programs look into the matter of appropriate drug testing for student athletes and confer with appropriate members of the President's Task Force on this subject as well as personnel in USC's School of Medicine. In turn, this lead the Vice President and me to decide to undertake a thorough view of the student athletic program at USC-Salkehatchie, and, in general, to caution other University Campuses before embarking on any expanded program in intercollegiate athletics. The issues of liability as well as implications for providing adequate student support services for students whose home of record may not be the original county service area of a particular University Campus are indeed enormous. We will be further reviewing this matter between now and the next meeting of the University Campuses Faculty Senate and we will report to you on this subject in September of 1988.

Status of Off-Campus Programs

You will recall that Vice President Duffy and I have spoken to and with you at numerous previous meetings about the matter of the pending CHE review of our off-campus programs (affectionately known as the "Twigs"). It is now a matter of central administration policy that all campuses of the University System will submit simultaneously as one package for review their off-campus programs.

This will be routed through internal University governance channels for submission to the Board of Trustees at its July 1988 meeting and then forwarded on to CHE. We are hopeful that this will be a routine matter and that CHE approval will be forthcoming without complications. This will be a matter that the University will treat as a highest priority for achieving our desired ends. Each of your campuses currently then is involved in the preparation and writing an appropriate proposal. For further information on the status of your campus's own proposal you should contact your Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Innovative South Carolina State College/USC-Salkehatchie Proposal

Some of you may not be aware, but one of our own campuses, USC-Salkehatchie, is currently attempting to make a type of South Carolina educational history. Specifically, USC-Salkehatchie will be the first state college or university institution to propose a cooperative joint degree venture with the historically black college, South Carolina State College. These two institutions are currently designing a proposal which will go forward to CHE to enable the South Carolina State College Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice to be made available to students at USC-Salkehatchie. For further information you should direct questions at the Senate meeting to Dean Clayton who has been very active in the development of this innovative proposal as have Associate Deans Killion and Brewer. When this proposal comes to fruition, it will be another example of how the University Campuses truly personify the President's vision of the "Learning Center" concept.

Peer Institution Salary Study

As we did several years ago, this Office has recently provided the University's Budget Office with "peer institution" salary data for other less-than-baccalaureate level campuses in multi-campus public education systems. Credit goes to Dr. Milton Baker for the work done on this study. It is our hope that once again we will be able to persuade the Commission on Higher Education to raise the amount in the formula allocated for faculty salaries based on this study of faculty salaries at comparable institutions. Copies of the particulars of this information have been provided to the University Campuses Faculty Senate Chair and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee.

Status of Release of Salary Information to the Welfare Committee

Even though this Office released in excruciating detail, in accordance with the new FOI legislation, in salary ranges of \$4000, the salary of every unclassified academic employee earning less than \$50,000 on all five campuses, we have been informed by the Chair

of the University Campuses Welfare Committee that this was not the information requested and that it is not sufficient. Instead, we have been pursuing the release of information requested by action of the Senate at its April 1987 meeting and reiterated by me in a letter in late August to the University System Vice President for Personnel. This office has now obtained the requested information which lists in descending order the salaries of all University Campuses faculty differentiating 11- and 12-month appointments from the 9-month appointments. It is the desire, intent, and policy of this Office to scrupulously abide by the FOI legislation while simultaneously protecting what little privacy is left to individuals. Consequently it is the decision of this Office not to release the information which reveals salary information as requested differentiating 11- and 12-month appointments from the 9-month appointments, by campus. This would enable determination of individual salaries by attribution. Instead, after the data is verified for accuracy and any statistical anomalies are resolved, the data will be released in composite format combining all five Campuses. Vice President Duffy, his Executive Assistant and Business Manager, Mary Derrick, will have more information on this for you at the Senate meeting.

Review of Grievance Procedures and Procedures for Termination of Tenured Faculty

This Office has attempted to be of service to the University Campuses Faculty Senate Rights and Responsibilities Committee in making recommendations as to problems encountered during the past year when either our faculty have sought to file a grievance according to the grievance procedures in the Faculty Manual and/or the instance when the University administration took action to terminate a tenured faculty appointment. The University Campuses Faculty Senate Welfare Committee has had several meetings on the matter, has considered my written thoughts and sentiments about these subjects, and has also met with Associate General Counsel Lyn Hensel. The subcommittee chair, Professor Carolyn West, is the appropriate person to report on the subcommittee disposition of this matter. Suffice it to say that this Office stands ready to work with the Rights and Responsibilities Committee and with the Faculty Senate over the coming year to further strengthen the appropriate procedures of the Faculty Manual and to resolve any continuing difficulties which may remain in these specific passages.

Super Saturday Placement Tests

As you are probably all aware, the University will be implementing a new core curriculum this coming fall which is necessitating placement testing of all students. This testing is in foreign

John Gardner's Remarks to Senate
April 22, 1988
Page 4

languages and mathematics for all students bound to the Columbia curriculum, including University Campuses students. For those students who are bound for Columbia, the University will do placement tests on two Saturdays in May which are now being dubbed "Super Saturday". The testing is being coordinated through the Columbia Office of Institutional Research and can only be executed with the cooperation and assistance of personnel on the University Campuses. Columbia-admitted students throughout the state are being advised as to potential test sites and dates and given the option of choosing where these tests will be taken. Students currently admitted to University Campuses may also take their tests at this time. In some respects, this is an imposition on the time of personnel on University Campuses to participate in this testing program during their normal free Saturdays. But, if we are to be part of the University System, we are inextricably involved in this matter. In addition, increased assessment instruments are the wave of the future as is clearly evident in entry assessment activities in scores of states elsewhere in the nation. Finally, if The Cutting Edge is indeed adopted by the Legislature, it carries stipulations that institutions must move forward to develop individual assessment plans. So in some respects, we haven't seen anything yet! If you have questions about the particulars of the Super Saturday placement tests on your own campus, they should be directed to your Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Needless to say, these officers as well as myself and David Hunter of this Office have been intimately involved with Columbia personnel in the development of these procedures.

Implementation of Core Curriculum

As in the above matter, the University Campuses Academic Deans have participated in discussions with Columbia officials from the departments of Mathematics and Foreign Languages and Literatures to discuss the specifics of implementing the requirements of a new core curriculum on the University Campuses. We are gearing up to be compatible with the changes and the Associate Deans for Academic Affairs will be providing you with appropriate information for advisement and instructional purposes. System faculty meetings are also being held in Foreign Languages (I regret that it is on April 22) and, hopefully, Mathematics in May, to discuss these kinds of future changes.

I hope you have a good meeting. Again, my sincerest regrets about my absence.

Recommendations from Welfare Committee
April 22, 1988

1. Salary Studies

A. Each campus gives a list (without names) of all salaries of employees with faculty rank. This list would be divided into two parts, one with those faculty with eleven/twelve-month contracts and the other with those faculty with nine-month contracts. Each part would contain the following information on each individual salary:

- i) 1987-88 salary
- ii) the amount of raise based on the percentage increase given to each faculty member who performed his/her assigned duties satisfactorily
- iii) additional merit pay
- iv) amount of low-end adjustment

A suggested format for the two parts of this report (to be completed by each campus) is attached.

B. The salary study that has been generated in the past should be continued for the academic year 1988-89.

C. All salary information provided by Milt Baker via John Gardner to the Welfare Committee which was provided by the System Office of Institutional Research should be given to the Welfare Committee for 1988-89 salaries.

2. Recommendations for salary increases

A. A substantial part of the money available for merit increases should be used to give an across-the-board percentage merit raise for all faculty performing their assigned duties satisfactorily. As a minimum, this percentage increase should be equal to the percentage increase that is given to all classified state employees.

Additional merit should be awarded on the basis of outstanding contribution to the institution, and should only be awarded in cases in which a person has clearly contributed beyond what most faculty have done.

B. Particular attention should be given to length of service and total years of experience with regard to low-end adjustments. As a model for these low-end adjustments, local school district salary schedules should be used so that, as a minimum, a faculty member's salary would be that of a primary or secondary teacher's salary based on years of experience and educational level.

Eleven/Twelve Month Faculty

1986-87 Salary Amount from % Increase Additional Merit Low End Adjustment

Nine Month Faculty

1986-87 Salary Amount from % Increase Additional Merit Low End Adjustment

Eleven/Twelve Month Faculty

1986-87 Salary Amount from % Increase Additional Merit Low End Adjustment

Nine Month Faculty

1986-87 Salary Amount from % Increase Additional Merit Low End Adjustment