UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

FEBRUARY 17, 1989

USC-Salkehatchie

Informal Session

Chair Greg Labyak welcomed the Senate members to the group's first
meeting of 1989. He also welcomed Chancellor John Duffy, Vice
Chancellor John Gardner, Associate Chancellor Jim Edwards,
Assistant Vice Chancellor David Hunter, and a new senator from
Union, Jimmie Williamson, as well as the Academic Deans from the
University Campuses and the scheduled speaker, Dr. JoAnn Anderson
from LaGuardia Community College in New York.

The Chair then called for the Deans' reports.

Dean Carl Clayton extended a welcome to all in attendance. He
acknowledged the efforts of three of his staff members who helped
with the Thursday evening Oyster Roast and the Friday social events.
These were Patty Williams, Nelia Lightsey, and Rufus Smith. He
noted that President Holderman had been at Salkehatchie a few days
before and that the architectural engineering funds for the
Campus's new library/computer science building have been approved.
Salkehatchie's enrollment has increased somewhat since last spring.

Senator Ali Pyarali added his greetings to those of the Dean and
announced particulars about the day's meetings and activities.

The Chair requested that the remainder of the Deans' reports be
postponed to the afternoon session.

Vice Chancellor Gardner introduced the guest speaker,
Dr. JoAnn Anderson. He explained that he had been impressed with
Dr. Anderson's presentation at a conference earlier this year
because of her knowledge and experience in a University whose
student body is similar in many respects to that of the USC System
Campuses. Dr. Anderson is a licensed counseling psychologist in
New York state, has a doctorate from Columbia University, and has
been a faculty member for almost twenty years at an open admis-
sions urban institution facing "an enormous range of challenges in
serving a heterogeneous constituency." She works with faculty in
discovering their own areas of expertise and talents and in
advising about strategies that will enhance instruction. Vice
Chancellor Gardner sees Dr. Anderson's methods as ones which may
be of potential value to University Campuses faculty in their
efforts to improve the quality of instruction on their campuses.

Dr. Anderson's presentation was very well received by the Senate.
Information about her program can be found in Attachment 1. Chair
Labyak suggested that the University Campuses faculty might want
to consider inviting Dr. Anderson to present workshops on the
various campuses at a later date.

General Session

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

Chair Labyak called the meeting to order and asked if there were any corrections or additions to the Minutes of the November meeting. There being none, it was moved and seconded to accept the Minutes as presented. The motion was carried.

II. Deans' Reports

Dean Anderson from USC-Sumter was not present.

Dean Arnold from USC-Lancaster was not present and Dean Barry was in the Academic Deans' meeting.

In the absence of Dean Davis, Professor Tandy Willis gave a report for USC-Union. Enrollment is up about 20% in headcount and 10% in FTEs at Union. The Central Building has been occupied and renovations to the Main Building are in the planning stage. In addition, Facilities Planning has requested that the preliminary plans for the Campus's third phase of development be submitted. A search will be conducted to fill the position of Dean of Student Affairs as Dean Steve Buchanan is returning to full-time teaching.

Dean Tuttle from USC-Beaufort reported that renovations have begun on the old Beaufort Elementary School next to the Campus. When the construction is completed, the building will contain a 500-seat performing arts center, classrooms, and a student center. Additional funding is being sought for lighting and sound equipment and for stage rigging. The proposed completion date is January 1990. The Southern Association study is proceeding well under the leadership of Ellen Chamberlain. Enrollment is up about 5% this spring. Over the last two years headcount enrollment has gone up about 40%. Professor Ed Caine is on sabbatical at Washington State University. Professor Somers Miller will take a sabbatical next academic year. Bachelor's degree programs are being offered at USC-Beaufort through USC-Aiken and USC-Columbia under the leadership of Lila Meeks. Elderhostel programs have been established by Nancy Dunlap. These programs were offered at Hilton Head, Beaufort and Penn Center, enrolling about fifty participants each. The Vienna Choir Boys performed at USC-Beaufort earlier this year.

Dean May of Lifelong Learning had no report.

III. Reports of University Officers

A. Dr. John J. Duffy, Chancellor for University Campuses and Continuing Education (Attachment 2)

Dr. Duffy explained that several campuses' mission statements have been returned because they included objectives

2

as part of the mission statement or because the wording was too expansive, but that the problems were minor.

In the ongoing discussion about provision of higher education in the state, Dr. Duffy reassured the Senate that President Holderman is unequivocally opposed to giving up any Campuses to the TEC school system. The University administration believes that if there are to be community colleges in the state, the University should run them. The Commission on Higher Education will consider the TEC schools' request concerning college parallel programs in November. Dr. Duffy and Vice Chancellor Gardner had a favorable meeting with the Chairman of the Commission on Higher Education, Mr. Jack Whitener, concerning the future of higher education in the state.

Senator Rod Sproatt asked Dr. Duffy if the issue of the ways rank and tenure of faculty would be affected by possible merging of the TEC and University systems had been discussed. Dr. Duffy replied that Mr. Whitener was aware of this issue and of the conflict between the University's tenure practices and the TEC schools' lack of such practices and of faculty organizations.

The budget, which is currently being considered by the Ways and Means Committee of the State Legislature now stands at 91% of full formula funding. The Chair of the House Committee would like to see the funding raised to 93%. The Senate often adds about 2% to the House recommendation so a 95% budget is possible this year. Each point represents a gain or loss of about $4-5 million. Dr. Duffy pointed out that the University and Four-Year Campuses usually receive increases when the formula is not fully funded while the Columbia Campus does not.

Dr. Duffy distributed copies of a draft brochure designed to explain a service which is available through the Office of Telecommunications Instruction and Independent Learning's Distance Education Program. The brochure shows the prescribed procedure for students who want to take courses leading to an external BAIS degree. The program was designed by Susan Bridwell and has been approved by the Dean of the College of Applied Professional Sciences.

Dr. Duffy called the group's attention to a portion of his written report concerning the University's acquisition of an IBM supercomputer at a reduced price. He emphasized the importance of the University's maintaining computer power equal to its potential needs such as the new automated library system and faculty research, among others.

B. Professor John N. Gardner, Vice Chancellor for University Campuses and Continuing Education (Attachment 3)

Professor Gardner provided the Senate with the voice mail numbers for himself and Dr. Duffy. A user dials 777-4043 to access the University's voice mail system. Instructions are then given about how the system works and an individual's number may be dialed. Access to messages is by secret code so that confidentiality is preserved. Dr. Duffy's voice mail number is 74205 and Professor Gardner's is 73480.

Professor Gardner addressed the problem of System articulation among the Campuses. Last fall, it was decided that the University Campuses Academic Deans should transmit information about such problems to David Hunter who has put together a position paper on the topic. This paper was sent to the Provost in January. Copies will be sent by Dr. Duffy's office to all Senators within a few days. The Provost then arranged a meeting with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Mr. Hunter, Vice President Dennis Pruitt, and Associate Provost Michael Welsh to discuss disarticulation. This group expressed concern to President Holderman who addressed the matter at the System Administration and Faculty Retreat on January 27. Provost Smith decided to refer the University Campuses Faculty Senate's April 1988 report on articulation to the Systemwide Academic Planning Committee which is the only University body with oversight responsibility for intra-campus concerns of this type. Professor Bruce Nims is the University Campuses Faculty Senate representative on this Committee. Concern with articulation problems between USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Aiken were brought to the attention of President Holderman earlier this week and he assured the Salkehatchie students that the problem would be solved. Professor Gardner commended the University Campuses Faculty Senate for its actions last academic year in studying and reporting on this problem.

IV. Reports from Standing Committees

A. Rights and Responsibilities Committee--
Professor John Logue (Sumter)

Professor Logue reported on several motions that had been submitted by the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee to the Executive Committee for consideration and referral. The Rights and Responsibilities Committee decided these proposals needed further study prior to submission to the Senate.

The Faculty Manual Revision Committee met on February 16. Professor Jerry Dockery, who chairs this committee, was requested to report to the Senate on progress and plans.

4

Professor Dockery announced that a draft of the Manual would be sent to the Senators for distribution to the faculty. The Committee will meet in Columbia March 4 and 5 to continue its work. When the draft is completed, it will be sent to Dr. Duffy's office and to the University's Legal Department for review. The corrected version should then be available for Senate action at the April meeting. The Manual will be issued in a loose-leaf format so that changes can readily be made.

Professor Gardner cautioned the Senate that the Legal Office may be slower than usual in reviewing the Manual because of new personnel whose familiarity with University policies is of limited duration.

B.   Welfare Committee--Professor Mary Barton (Union)

Still reviewing salary information (see December 16, 1988 salary analysis and February 16, 1989 salary information). We will further examine and discuss this information at the April meeting as the information from the Office of the Chancellor was not available until after the meeting on February 17.

A survey will be circulated among the faculty to assess the adequacy of university support available. It is requested that these surveys be returned by March 31 so that the Committee can compile and discuss this information at the April meeting.

Professor Don Curlovic asked why the salary information provided was not campus-specific. Professor Gardner replied that the small number of people represented by the statistics required that they all be treated together in order to insure anonymity. He invited the Senate members to address any specific questions about salary concerns to the Chancellor's Office in writing so that the proper research could be done to provide answers.

Professor Dockery suggested that the Welfare Committee distribute a release form so that faculty members who wished to do so could allow their exact salaries to be known.

Professor Gardner replied that he felt that the specific type of data which such a form could provide would not appreciably alter salary efforts and decisions made in the Chancellor's Office.

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

The Committee reviewed the Associate Degree core curricula from USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Union (see Attachment 4) and recommended that both be approved by the Senate with the

rationale that diversity of institutional needs within the System and respect for the decisions of campus faculty organizations are essential. Concern had been expressed among committee members regarding a lack of consistency between associate degree curricula and requirements for bachelors degrees in the USC System. Ideally there should be sufficient humanities requirements for an Associate of Arts degree and sufficient math and science requirements for an Associate of Science degree.

Professor Costello moved that the two core curricula be approved.

There was discussion about math and history requirements at Union and humanities requirements at Salkehatchie, but no amendments to the motion were offered. Chair Labyak remarked that the core requirements apply only to the campus that submits them. Professor Rod Sproatt stated that when the USC-Beaufort faculty drew up a core curriculum they were told by the Chancellor's Office that the curriculum had to be approved by the Senate, but that the Senate felt the campus faculty should be able to put in place the core curriculum of their choice.

The chair called for a vote on the Committee's motion. It was carried.

The Committee discussed a name change and agreed to propose the name System Affairs Committee as suggested by Professor Tandy Willis. A motion to this effect was made and was carried.

The Committee also reviewed progress of data collection regarding curricula articulation, honors courses, women's studies, interdisciplinary courses, recruitment and retention efforts, and progress of institutional self-studies. Other discussions included the desirability of continuity in committee operations from year to year and Manual ambiguities regarding respective roles of local faculty organizations and the Senate.

V.   Executive Committee--Professor Nancy Washington (Lifelong Learning)

The Committee discussed issues such as the Tenure and Promotion Committee's motions, mission statements, TEC school vs. University roles, articulation problems and other matters which have already been addressed. The Committee also discussed plans for a promotional brochure to publicize the University Campuses in their respective communities. Professor Carolyn West drew up a dummy brochure which presents information about former students at the Campuses who have gone on to hold important positions and make worthwhile contributions to their state and society. Professors West and Washington will work with the University Relations Office

6

in Columbia to design a brochure to be available possibly by fall semester.

Chair Labyak suggested that ideas for the brochure be shared with other faculty and Professor Washington invited input from any Senators who were interested in the project.

VI.   Reports from Special Committees

   A.   University Library Committee--Professor John Catalano
         (USC-Lancaster)

   The Faculty Library Advisory Committee met on November 18, 1988 at 2:00 p.m.

   Dr. Connelly read a letter from Ben Gimarc requesting the committee to consider increased access to Cooper Library at night and during weekends and holidays. The matter was tabled for later discussion.

   Gary Geer (library staff) reported on library disaster preparedness planning.

   On a 4-2 vote, the committee approved the Library's mission statement following discussion of Dr. Eccles' concerns that the mission was contained in the first paragraph and the remainder of the document detailed implementation steps and Catalano's objection that the teaching mission of Thomas Coopers' librarians is not sufficiently explained.

   The Committee approved extension of inter-library loan privileges to area libraries on Eccles/Catalano motion.

   New Business

   1.   Dr. Scott requested Vice President Terry to look into drafting a faculty book return policy.

   2.   Library selectors will be working more closely with University departments to achieve increased coordination in the book selection process.

   3.   Professor Catalano asked if accreditation changes will affect the library administrative relationship between main campus and University Campus libraries.

   4.   Vice President Terry polled the committee concerning the inclusion of satellite libraries in the cataloging process.

   The Committee adjourned for a demonstration of the On-Line Catalog System. The next meeting was not yet scheduled.

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

The Committee has approved for Columbia Senate considera-
tion the following changes:

      BIOL 243 & 243L ┐
      BIOL 244 & 244L ┘ Human Anatomy & Physiology I & II
      ENGL 289 changed to ENGL 288
      ENGL 290 changed to ENGL 289
      ENGL 402 Spenser & the English Renaissance to The
         Renaissance
      BADM 380 added THSP 140 as prerequisite and small
         name change

Some changes to curricula:

      some editorial changes to NURS
      some changes to JOUR
      major renumbering changes and name changes in PHAR
      BADM dropped Administrative Management option in the
         Management concentration

There are a few more experimental courses; at the 300
level:

      GEOG X337 Maps and Human Affairs

A discussion took place concerning the impact these changes
may have on courses offered on the University Campuses.
Professor Castleberry informed the Senate that he had files
of all the actions taken by the Committee on Curricula and
Courses and would make these available upon request.

C.   University Faculty Welfare Committee--Professor Don
      Curlovic (USC-Sumter)

The Committee discussed the option of allowing faculty
members to be paid over twelve months.

The Committee also discussed salary concerns and recom-
mended that the criteria for merit raises be given at each
unit level.

Professor Gardner remarked that President Holderman had
told the Salkehatchie faculty that the Administration
would request 8% average merit raises for faculty this
year and annually hereafter.

A discussion took place about the problems which members
of the Universitywide committees have in attending meetings
and in receiving notices of meeting times and dates.
Professor Gardner suggested the Chair and/or the committee
members concerned contact Ms. Peggy Pickles who handles the
mailing of meeting notices.

D.   Academic Planning Committee--Professor Bruce Nims
     (USC-Lancaster)

The Systemwide Academic Planning Committee has met twice
since the last meeting of the University Campuses Faculty
Senate: December 14, 1988 and January 25, 1989.

The subject for the December 14 meeting was the organiza-
tion of a study of summer school. Subcommittees were
assigned to study the following issues related to summer
school at the University of South Carolina.

1.   Summer school sessions at major Southeast universities
     for purposes of comparison;

2.   Optimum times for class meetings and class duration
     during summer school sessions;

3.   Summer school in USC Schools of Law and Medicine;

4.   Summer school associations--what useful purposes do
     they serve?

The subject for the January 25 meeting was a resolution
passed by the USC-Spartanburg Faculty Senate that would
allow their students to repeat courses for credit with
only the final grade included in the GPA. USC-S Faculty
Senate Secretary Faruk Tanyel attended the meeting along
with USC Registrar T. L. Gunter. As a result of the
deliberations, the Academic Planning Committee made the
following recommendations to Dr. Arthur Smith, USC
Executive Vice President and Provost:

     A.   We recommend that the System student record keep-
          ing be made uniform, requiring that policies be
          standard in the following categories:

          1.   Grading (i.e., grades, academic credit, cal-
               culation of G.P.A.)

          2.   Honors (for graduation, dean's lists, and
               similar recognition);

          3.   Suspension;

          4.   Course acronym/designators and number
               systems.

     B.   In accordance with item A, the committee recom-
          mends that the Spartanburg resolution not be
          approved.

     C.   The committee recommends that a procedure be
          proposed, approved by appropriate authority, and

published which would allow desirable changes to be made in student record keeping policies in a timely and organized fashion.

D. The Academic Planning Committee offers its services to create or design the procedure referred to in item C.

The Committee did not address the problem of how policies in item A which are not presently uniform might be changed to make them standard.

The next meeting for the Academic Planning Committee is set for February 22, 1989. The new subject for that meeting will be "Intrasystem Articulation Policies." The committee will also hear subcommittee reports on the summer school issues brought up in the December meeting.

E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee--Professor Somers Miller (USC-Beaufort)

The Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the University of South Carolina's Board of Trustees met on Wednesday, February 15, 1989, in the conference room of the Osborne Administration Building.

Bill Bethea of Hilton Head was reelected Chairman of the Committee.

The Committee approved the following proposals:

1. A Bachelor of Arts with a major in sociology at USC-Spartanburg.

2. A Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, USC-Columbia.

3. A Certificate of Graduate Study in Alcohol and Drug Studies, Graduate School (College of Health), USC-Columbia.

4. A Master of Arts in anthropology, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, USC-Columbia.

After consideration of the above matters, the Committee then met in closed session to discuss personnel matters of a confidential nature.

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

The Committee has not met since last year and will meet in April to review proposals. Proposals will be received by reviewers in March.

VII. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

VIII. New Business

There was no new business.

IX. Announcements

The Chair asked Vice Chair Deborah Cureton who is ex officio chair of the Nominating Committee to inform the Senate members of the offices which are vacant.

Professor Cureton announced the Nominating Committee members:

USC-Beaufort	Professor Jane Upshaw
USC-Lancaster	Professor Deborah Cureton
Lifelong Learning	Professor John Stine
USC-Salkehatchie	Professor Ali Pyarali
USC-Sumter	Professor Bob Costello
USC-Union	Professor Mary Barton

Offices the Committee will offer candidates for include: University Library Committee, Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee, Research and Productive Scholarship Committee, Secretary for the Senate, and members at large on the Executive Committee.

The Chair asked persons now serving in these positions who wish to continue and are eligible to do so to notify the Nominating Committee of their interest.

The Chair told the Senate that the Executive Committee had recommended inviting Commissioner Fred Sheheen to address the April Senate meeting and this invitation will be issued.

The April meeting will not be held at the Baruch Institute as had previously been planned but will be held at USC-Beaufort.

X. Adjournment

The Chair declared the meeting to be adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Washington
Secretary

Attendance February 17, 1989

BEAUFORT
Present
John Blair	Welfare
Rick Boulware	Executive
Ellen Chamberlain	Welfare
Rod Sproatt	
Jane Upshaw	R&R

Absent
Dave McCollum	IUSC

LANCASTER
Present
Noni Bohonak	Welfare
John Catalano	IUSC
Wade Chittam	Welfare
Deborah Cureton	Executive
Jerry Currence	R&R
Bruce Nims	R&R
Wayne Thurman	IUSC

LIFELONG LEARNING
Present
Linda Allman	R&R
Dave Bowden	Welfare
Steve Dalton	IUSC
Jerry Dockery	R&R
John Stine	R&R
Nancy Washington	Executive

SALKEHATCHIE
Present
Milton Harden	R&R
Susan Moscow	Welfare
Ali Pyarali	Executive
Paul Stone	IUSC

SUMTER
Present
Robert Castleberry	IUSC
Bob Costello	IUSC
Don Curlovic	Welfare
Jean Hatcher	Welfare
John Logue	R&R
Has Raval	Welfare
Carolyn West	Executive

Absent
Jordan Johnson	R&R
Kay Oldhouser	Welfare

UNION
Present
Mary Barton	Welfare
Greg Labyak	Executive
Susan Smith	R&R
Jimmy Williamson	IUSC
Tandy Willis	Executive

12

LITERACY AND LEARNING:
INTEGRATED SKILLS REINFORCEMENT (ISR)

For further information or a copy of the ISR text, contact:
Dr. JoAnn Anderson   *(Longman)*
Project Director
LaGuardia Community College
City University of New York
31-10 Thomson Avenue
Long Island City, NY 11101
(718) 482-5690

LITERACY AND LEARNING:
INTEGRATED SKILLS REINFORCEMENT (ISR)

Program Perspective, Background and Text

Over the past two decades students with steadily declining
abilities have come to college in increasing numbers. Many
students with serious weaknesses in basic skills, have been
sitting in both college and high school classrooms; and many
faculty seeing such students and such skills have been teaching
courses that often bypass analytical approaches to content
through reading, writing, and speaking. The crisis in literacy
has become a crisis in learning, for the two--literacy and
learning--are inextricably connected: language is the means to
content, and content provides the necessary context for
developing and advancing linguistic and analytical abilities
(AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 3,
"Functional Literacy in the College Setting," 1981). Basic
skills programs--"remedial," if you will--cannot alone prepare
students adequately for the demands of the various disciplines.
Therefore, the responsibility for overseeing not just the
learning of content, but also for overseeing literacy in relation
to content, has passed on to the subject area teacher. Yet while
more and more teachers recognize this responsibility, they also
sense their lack of preparation to meet it. Graduate schools
prepare college teachers in their field of inquiry, whether in a
technical or liberal arts and science area, but these teachers
often have to pick up pedagogy on the job. And even high school
teachers, though trained in "methods," generally are not trained

in methods that address literacy and learning for a growing segment of today's students.

In 1978 LaGuardia Community College, a branch of the City University of New York, set out to develop a program to redress the problem of literacy and learning, a program that would draw dedicated teachers into the search for solutions. Not surprisingly the task was complicated. First, the literature tended to focus on the reasons why language skills should be reinforced in content classes, not on specific techniques to help students make better use of their linguistic skills in exploring the disciplines. Further, what little had been done in this area in the United States generally focused on only one skills area, most often writing and occasionally reading. No programs at that time focused on integrating reading, writing, oral and aural skills. Yet an integrated program seemed essential. In Britain, for example, a governmental committee set up to address and redress declining reading skills, asserted that expressive (speaking, writing) and receptive (listening, reading) modes of language were critically interwoven. In fact, the title that the committee selected for its final report, A Language for Life (Department of Education and Science. Bullock Report. London, 1975), insists upon the ubiquitous role of language in our existence. Therefore, when the committee made its final recommendations, it called not for a national policy on reading but for a policy of "language across the curriculum."

Our program honored this recommendation. But finding no linguistically integrated model to draw on, we turned to our own

2

15

experiences. We began with the premise that good teachers as they work with students almost instinctively discover strategies for strengthening students' use of language in learning course content. These strategies anchor the teaching of content. Perhaps, for example, a teacher begins the course by previewing with students the overall structure of the text; she points out that subheadings provide a running outline of the content covered and thus helps students develop a mental schema for the material ahead. Or perhaps a teacher gives students sets of thought-provoking questions to guide reading or to focus listening in a lecture or discussion. Or perhaps a teacher provides students with repeated opportunities to use writing to summarize knowledge, to reinforce procedures, to analyze arguments, or even to identify areas of confusion.

Whatever strategy any one teacher creates, chances are that some colleague in another area or even at another institution has already discovered that same strategy or might discover it shortly. Such "reinvention of the wheel" seemed to us a waste of valuable time. Thus, during the 1978-79 academic year, at the behest of and with support from LaGuardia's Dean of Faculty, Martin Moed, and with the collaboration of our colleagues (in particular, Carol Rivera-Kron and John Holland) we drew together successful language-rich approaches to curriculum from teachers in liberal arts, science and professional areas. And in the following year we piloted these strategies with teachers across subject areas to determine which strategies would be most widely effective. The most successful approaches were published in a text, Integrated Skills Reinforcement: Reading, Writing,

3

16

Speaking and Listening Across the Curriculum (Longman, 1983), and this text has since become the cornerstone of a faculty development program rooted in concern for student learning. The most significant feature of this text, we believe, is that good teachers find themselves in various parts of it. As they leaf through the text, faculty in the program can often be heard saying, "I do this." What they also say is that they like the way the strategies are presented, in step-by-step fashion, allowing faculty to incorporate and adapt them easily. With its five major divisions--Assessing Students' Communication Skills Levels in Relation to Content Courses; Helping Students Write for Content Courses; Encouraging Students' Effective Use of Oral and Listening Skills in Content Courses; Helping Students Read Successfully in Content Courses; and Integrating Language Skills for Content Mastery--the text allows teachers to build courses on a firm foundation of literacy.

The Training Program: A Student-Centered Approach to Faculty Development

The ISR text was an important development, providing faculty with practical advice for bringing language strategies (reading, writing, speaking and listening) to bear on particular course content. But at the time we wrote the book, it was clear that our faculty wanted more than a reference manual. They wanted a "program" that would help them facilitate real change in their classrooms. So we set out to develop such a program, paying close attention to the factors now seen as essential to success in training (see, for reference, Nelsen and Siegel, Effective

4

17

Approaches to Faculty Development. Washington, D.C.:
Association of American Colleges, 1980). First, we committed the
program to the principles of collaboration and collegiality:
instructional development programs too often fail because they
approach the teacher as the problem instead of recognizing the
teacher as the agent for change. At LaGuardia we began with the
assumption that our teachers had enormous talents as classroom
instructors. We asked our teachers to reflect on their
experiences and to address the questions: What problems are
students experiencing in dealing effectively with coursework?
How can we together help students overcome their difficulties?
And we used teachers' feedback as our guide for program
development. A second key ingredient for success, we thought, was
time--time for faculty to do the curriculum development necessary
for revitalized learning in the classroom. Our administration
recognized this and provided course release for faculty to
participate in a year-long training program. A third essential
element, also encouraged from the start, was a small group structure
for training, a structure that builds on the collegiality and
collaboration often lost over time in large academic settings.
And finally, we sought to integrate into the training program a
fourth key element--a meaningful application of what faculty learn.

But now to describe the program. Training takes place over
an academic year and is on a voluntary basis. Throughout the
fall term, program participants (usually about twelve to twenty
faculty members) meet weekly in small interdisciplinary work
groups (four to six faculty members) under the guidance of a team

5

18

leader who also has gone through the program. With the
strategies in the ISR text as a guide, faculty devise their own
classroom applications for the first unit of a course of their
choice, which they will teach in the spring. Initial focus on a
single unit seems critical for faculty to acquire a feeling for
how "integrated reinforcement" works. Next, using the target
unit as a base, each faculty member develops what is needed to
build challenging materials and activities into the rest of the
course. And the weekly meeting in a small group setting, with
careful feedback from a team leader and ongoing peer critiquing
by other group members, ensures that each participant experiences
in-depth attention to his or her needs. For example, the ISR
text explores the brief writing assignment as an important
classroom activity for facilitating learning in the disciplines.
The book encourages faculty to consider the value of short
writing assignments and guides faculty in structuring tasks to
pose for students. Through careful work with the team leader and
colleagues, faculty discover appropriate places and formats for
each assignment in the course, and also which assignments might
be repeated again and again to facilitate a deeper level of
learning. A literature teacher might ask students to write
reaction statements after they finish reading a selection--to be
used in class to start discussion or to advance debate. A math
teacher might ask students to explain in writing how a homework
problem was solved--an effort designed to shed conceptual light
on problem-solving for the class; a history teacher might require
summaries of historical events or analyses of causes or results.
In short, each teacher applies the ISR strategies in different

6

ways, and the team leader and group help the teacher find ways that feel right--assignments that advance learning in a way that is tailored to particular disciplines, courses, teaching styles, and student needs.

By the end of the fall term participants have developed materials needed to apply all the strategies to their spring course. And they draw these materials together into what we call a "learning guide," which is reproduced for each student's use in the spring, when the teacher tries out her materials in the classroom. In the spring, as faculty teach their selected course, they also videotape lessons, annotate the learning guides, meet with their workshop group to discuss findings, and revise methods and procedures as needed.

By the end of the spring term, each instructor has a field-tested guide that helps students use reading, writing, speaking and listening as they think critically in relation to the subject at hand. And beyond individual use, these guides often serve as valuable resources for other faculty, especially adjuncts, teaching the same course.

Over 80% of LaGuardia's full-time faculty have been trained and this includes many department chairpeople. What do people who have participated in ISR say about the program? In assessing the ISR Project, a consultant from Columbia University, Teachers College, reveals that participating faculty internalize ISR approaches and believe themselves better able to teach their students. This and other evaluations of the ISR Project have judged the small group setting as critical to the program's

7
20

success. Program participants cite collaborative exploration of problems, goals, and materials as key to improving instruction and to producing materials that challenge students to think critically and creatively.

Faculty see improved class performance in areas previously viewed as too difficult for students to grasp. Students selected at random for interviews were five times more likely to enroll in a future course taught in the "ISR-mode" than in a course taught in the traditional mode, and students' responses to particular strategies have been overwhelmingly positive. Another assessment, a self-study conducted by a statistics professor, showed significant improvement in student achievement in course sections using ISR methods over comparable sections of the same course taught by him prior to ISR training. Other faculty are pursuing similar self-assessments. And this self-study approach seems a particularly viable one in faculty development efforts that build on trust and collegiality.

ISR as a Basis for Collaboration Within and Beyond the Institution

Curricular collaboratives. The ISR Program has spawned a number of intensive curriculum development efforts at our College. Of particular note is a project with our Math Department in which ISR-trained faculty have collaborated in developing linguistically-based materials for widespread use in a basic math course enrolling large numbers of students. The new materials provide contexts for discovery learning of basic mathematical principles, guiding students to use writing and

discussion to arrive at and advance understandings of important concepts. A recent pilot study of this work has shown a 20% increase in pass rate on a uniform final. Building on this project, we are at present developing linguistic strategies that will help students explore math concepts in content area courses such as biology and accounting.

Collaboratives with other colleges and graduate institutions. Based on the success of ISR at LaGuardia, other colleges within the City University of New York (CUNY) and elsewhere have adopted and adapted the program with considerable success. ISR programs now exist at CUNY's Bronx Community College, the State University of New York at Brockport, Essex County College in Newark, New Jersey, Middlesex Community College and Framingham State College in Massachusetts. Workshops on ISR have been offered at many institutions--Montana State University, Gonzaga University in Spokane, Dawson College in Montreal, Richland College in Dallas, Laredo State University and Western Carolina University, to name just a few. And currently the ISR program is being offered for graduate credit at Columbia University's Teachers College.

High School/College collaboratives. The ISR project also has provided a context for an exciting new venture in high school/ college partnerships. LaGuardia is fortunate to have on its campus the Middle College High School, an innovative and now nationally recognized alternative high school, replicated widely through Ford Foundation support. Almost from the start of the ISR program, Middle College teachers have been co-participants, working alongside college colleagues to find classroom solutions to shared problems.

Almost half of today's high school students go on to some form of postsecondary education--and academic problems travel along with many of them (Maeroff, School and College: Partnerships in Education, 1983). At LaGuardia it was clear that high school and college teachers needed to cooperate if students were to learn effectively at each level and to move successfully from one level to the next and beyond. High schools, of course, prepare students for college, but both institutions often tend to operate with little knowledge of each other's ways. The ISR partnership with its integrated perspective on language and learning has proved important to strengthening the educational chain. Recognizing this, CUNY's Office of Urban Affairs and the Hearst Foundation enabled us to refine the Middle College/LaGuardia ISR collaborative as a model which could be adapted to the needs of other LaGuardia feeder high schools. And the LaGuardia/Middle College partnership is now widening its focus and is launching a new initiative, an initiative which has teachers from both levels engaged in the exploration of the scope of general education within and between the institutions.

*   *   *   *   *

The development of the ISR Program and its collaborative ventures have been made possible over the years by the care and support of LaGuardia's administration as well as by the generosity and encouragement of the U.S. Office of Education (Title III), New York State Education Department (VocEd), the City University of New York (Office of Urban Affairs) and the

Hearst Foundation. ISR has been named a "Project of Excellence" in a state-wide competition sponsored by the Two-Year College Development Center, SUNY Albany, and the Grants Administration Bureau of the New York State Education Department. And the National Association for Remedial/Developmental Studies in Postsecondary Education (NARDSPE) awarded its first annual John Champaigne Memorial Award to LaGuardia's developmental program-- of which ISR is an integral part--citing LaGuardia's program as representing the "best of current practice in the field."

ISR has demonstrated its power to create dynamic faculty communities dedicated to serving varied student constituencies. And this experience seems to suggest the type of faculty development program that can play an important role in addressing major educations problems that exist today in schools and colleges alike. ISR collaboratives provide faculty with the time and environment to rethink and rework curriculum, with teachers coming out of the program no longer depleted by isolated struggle, but rather revitalized and rededicated. For in these small educational communities, teachers together discover approaches that help students find in language, not a wall, but rather a door to learning and knowledge.

24

REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR
FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
USC-Salkehatchie
February 17, 1989

Probably the most important task facing our Campuses in the next year is the ongoing Self-Study. I am very pleased to announce that the Campuses' individual mission statements have been reviewed by the Core Committee and that in only a few cases have minor changes been suggested. I hope that the mission statements and the goal statements will be finished before this month is out. Each Campus has committees to deal with the issues and my Office will be available for assistance. If you have specific questions about the Self-Study, contact Jim Edwards (7-4800), Associate Chancellor, or David Bell (7-6455), who is the Administrative Director of the Self-Study in Columbia.

I would also like to comment on the Commission on Higher Education's consideration of TEC's request for college-parallel programs at the nine TEC campuses which do not currently have them. This issue is currently being discussed by Mr. Sheheen, Dr. Morris, and Dr. Holderman. Dr. Holderman has stated very clearly that the University of South Carolina will not give up any campus of The USC System. There are many options being considered. I really can't say more than I have said above but I can assure you, however, that nothing has yet been agreed upon. We have been advised by the Commission to hold off on our Twig proposals until this TEC issue has been resolved.

Recently, John Gardner and I visited the Chair of the Commission, Jack Whitener. We had a very full discussion of the issues facing the University and the Commission at this time.

The House Ways and Means Committee is currently considering the University's budget request. The chairman of the subcommittee is talking in terms of 93% of full formula at this time. The most optimistic estimates that I have heard for the final budget are in the range of 95%. There are several one-time-only requests including USC's request for $14,000,000 to match a grant from a major computer manufacturer for an academic computing center in Columbia. There is also a request from Clemson for approximately $10,000,000 to buy a CRAY computer.

Susan Bridwell of Telecommunications Instruction would like some University Campuses faculty input on a new brochure which has been put together by Telecommunications Instruction and the College of Applied Professional Sciences describing the possibilities for securing a BAIS degree using television and correspondence courses in addition to our regular courses. If any of you are interested in reviewing a draft of the brochure, I will have several available for your perusal.

FACTSHEET ON THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA SUPERCOMPUTER PLAN

Background

About three years ago, the National Science Foundation established five National Supercomputer Centers. These centers were established near five of the most prestigious universities in the country: Cornell, Illinois, University of Pittsburgh/Carnegie Mellon, University of California/San Diego, and Princeton University.

Since that time, many major universities throughout the United States have funded supercomputer centers. These include University of California/Berkeley, University of Texas, Alabama, Florida State, North Carolina, Ohio State, and The University of Georgia. Having a supercomputer center in one's state is important for several reasons: (1) to help attract high quality faculty and graduate students who need the power of these computers to attack advanced research problems; (2) to gain a national presence as one of the finer universities in the US that has such advanced computing facilities, and (3) to allow that same national prominence in research to help attract industrial firms to locate and develop infrastructure in South Carolina.

So What's New?

Until the NSF initiative, supercomputers were bought only for large governmental research labs and a few large oil companies. Because the market for such computers was not large, only two American companies, Cray and Control Data Corporation (CDC) built and sold such machines. IBM did not see this market as attractive a decade ago. But about two years ago, IBM decided that the time was right to compete in this market. They developed a very capable and cost effective approach to supercomputing which was different from all others: IBM built supercomputer capability into its standard line of computers. In this way, an IBM supercomputer can be used for normal computing functions such as student access, accounting, student records processing , as well as very demanding, large scale, scientific calculations.

Because of the significant research work and excellent faculty at The University of South Carolina, IBM is desirous of locating its largest computer system at The University of South Carolina. In addition, IBM hopes to fund faculty and scientists within South Carolina to help develop new software or modify existing software to operate on the IBM computer. The new computer system could also help The University of South Carolina and The Development Board in creating a stronger partnership with Research & Development divisions of South Carolina companies. Company scientists and university scientists could jointly work toward important commercial processes.

So What's the Cost?

The University of South Carolina has been planning to upgrade its present, aging, and overloaded computer system. In fact, USC included about $8 million for this purpose within USC's supplemental funding request that went to The Commission on Higher Education in September 1988. That request has not yet been acted upon, but is pending legislative action.

Within the past few months, IBM has offered USC this very large computer system (**the largest IBM computer system in the world**). IBM is willing to provide a 50% discount on this computer which has a list price of $28 million. That is, for $14 million, we could purchase a $28 million computer IBM's normal educational discount is between 15% and 25%, so this would be an enormous savings.

In addition, we are proposing that IBM provide, in addition to the 50% discount, about $3 million per year to help fund researchers, and to attract scientists to our state. This center would be designated as a National IBM Supercomputer Center and would result in untold publicity, interest, and noteworthy national attention. There is no telling what the result would be for economic development, but states like Texas, Illinois, and Georgia indicate the results have been truly significant.

What's the Hurry?

The opportunity to participate in this may not last much longer. IBM indicates that it must move on establishing about five or six centers like this one around the United States. If The University of South Carolina does not seize upon this, the offer could be withdrawn and offered to other prestigious higher education institutions.

But won't this hurt formula funding?

The $14 million being requested would come from the surplus funds anticipated for the 1988-89 fiscal year. Estimates of that surplus range from $60 million to over $100 million. The $14 million that would clearly make The University of South Carolina a major player in the National computer scene, appears a relatively inexpensive investment that can do so much for our state. Formula funding, on the other hand, comes from recurring budgets, and not from one-time money such as the budget surplus. Funding for this computer would not detract from the dollars available for formula funding for 1989-90.

But USC already acquired a "supercomputer" last year.

Yes, but that computer allows for experimental, not administrative uses of computing technology. American universities must be working on technologies that are 3, 5, and even 10 years into the future. The Gemini Massively Parallel computer at USC is already beginning to show results and will complement the large IBM supercomputer because the two together would provide researchers with a rich array of computing facilities, using whichever meets their needs best.

Did USC go through the CHE for this computer system?

Yes. The University of South Carolina did submit its request through the normal funding request process in 1988. The only thing different now relates to this new opportunity from IBM that could not be anticipated last year. Therefore, the request is now $14 million, instead of the previous $8 million.

Are there recurring costs?

Yes. All computer systems require ongoing maintenance and support. However, The University of South Carolina has already established a major infrastructure of computing support services. The added new costs of operating this largest IBM computer anywhere would be about $3.6 million. When viewed as $3.6 million out of a $500 million higher education budget, it does not loom large when one measures the outstanding opportunity such a computer system means to our state.

REPORT OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR
FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
USC-Salkehatchie
February 17, 1989

Continuing Discussion of CHE Assessment Guidelines

You will recall that shortly after the November Senate meeting
a furor developed. It became apparent to post-secondary institu-
tions in South Carolina that the Commission on Higher Education
was about to enact at its November meeting a set of guidelines for
assessment which would force institutions to have such programs
operational within approximately one-year's time. This timetable,
of course, is much more draconian than that involved in our own
accreditation review process. Due primarily to concerted efforts
of the University's central administration including an emergency
meeting of the System Committee, extensive lobbying, and a spec-
tacular personal presentation before CHE by our new Provost, Art
Smith, the matter was deferred for 60 days. Provost Smith has
continued leading the state institutional efforts to have a more
reasonable timetable developed and adopted by the Commission.

At its February meeting, CHE adopted a revised set of guidelines
and timetables which shall be circulated by this Office to the
Senate leadership and administrative personnel on our Campuses.

Legislative Appreciation Day

A task force has been appointed (on which the University Campuses
are represented by David Hunter and John Gardner) to plan a System
Legislative Appreciation Day which will be held Wednesday,
April 12. I cannot inform you at this time of the tentative plans
because they are still early in the discussion stages. At the
very least there will be a large reception for several thousand
people at the Coliseum on Wednesday evening. As the name implies,
the overall objective is to express our appreciation to the
members of the General Assembly.

AAHE Symposium on Faculty Governance

One of the nation's largest professional associations for higher
education faculty and administrative personnel is the American
Association for Higher Education. This year, at its annual
meeting in Chicago, they will offer for the first time a special
pre-conference meeting entitled "The Symposium on Faculty
Governance," April 1-2. This will feature speeches, discussion
groups, and working sessions specially designed for faculty senate
chairs. This Office will underwrite the attendance of both our
current Chair and the Chair-Elect. We hope that this is helpful
to our Senate leadership.

Freshman Year Experience Conference

This conference convenes, literally, only hours after this document will be read on February 17. However, it is not too late for you or any of your faculty colleagues to attend if you wish to do so. If you have not preregistered, simply arrive at the Radisson Hotel and we will register you. Bring along a travel authorization for my action and this Office will support your participation.

Faculty Exchange

For Summer 1989, seven University Campuses faculty will be the recipients of Faculty Exchange Program grants. Virtually everyone who applied from the University Campuses this year was funded. I continue to be impressed with the meritoriousness of these proposals.

Title III

This Office is again strongly encouraging campuses to pursue their pursuit of Title III funding. The federally sponsored programs for "developing institutions" which are literally changing the face of two of our Campuses, USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Lancaster. Colleagues from the other three Campuses are urged to visit those institutions to see exactly what a Title III grant can do. We are again retaining an external consultant, Dr. James Olliver of Pfeiffer College and providing assistance centrally for the final production of the grant documents themselves. Current recipients, USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Lancaster, have set high standards for the rest of us to emulate.

Action by USC-Spartanburg Faculty Senate

This matter raises issues which are similar to the matter of System articulation problems encountered by our students as addressed by Chancellor Duffy in his report. Similarly, Spartanburg Senate action requesting permission to change the policy on which GPA is calculated (currently a standard System procedure) was referred by the Provost to the Academic Planning Committee which is a System committee and which subsequently recommended to the Provost that the Spartanburg Senate action not be endorsed. Similarly, Provost Smith has referred our concerns about student articulation problems to the Academic Planning Committee. The University Campuses are represented on this committee by Professor Bruce Nims of USC-Lancaster. This is an extremely important task, to understate the matter.

Representation on Columbia Faculty Senate

For this body's information I would like to point out that the Columbia Faculty Senate By-Laws do not allow for Alternate representation. A "substitute" representative may attend for informational purposes in the absence of an elected Senator but that representative does not assume the voting/speaking rights of the Senator.

USC – Salkehatchie Core Curriculum
Proposal

I. Required Courses

	Semester Hours	
	AA	AS
Humanities ENGL 101, 102	6	6

Numerical and Analytical
  Reasoning, e.g., MATH 111
  or higher, CSCI, BADM 225-
  226, 291-292, other statistics,
  PHIL 110-111
	3	6*

Natural Sciences, e.g.,
  ASTR, BIOL, CHEM, GEOG
  201/202, GEOL, MSCI, PHYS,
  WOST 113
	3	8

Social and Behavioral
  Sciences, e.g., ANTH,
  ECON, GEOG (excluding
  201/202), GINT, HIST,
  PSYC, SOCY, WOST 112
	3	3

Electives or ongoing degree requirements	45	37
TOTAL	60	60

*must include 3 hours of MATH
(excluding MATH 501-502)

II. Cumulative 2.0 GPA

III. Last 15 semester hours earned within the
USC system.

Approved by USC-Salkehatchie faculty,
December 2, 1988.

USC-UNION CORE CURRICULA

I.	Required Courses	Semester AA	Hours AS	Notes
	ENGL 101, 102	6	6	1
	Numerical and Analytical Reasoning, e.g., MATH 111 or higher (excluding 501-502), CSCI, BADM 225-226, 291-292, other statistics, PHIL 110-111	3	6	2
	Humanities and Fine Arts, e.g., AFRO, ART, ENGL (200 level or above), FORL, MUSC, PHIL (except 110, 111), RELG, THSP, WOST 111	12	3	
	Social and Behavorial Sciences, e.g., ANTH, ECON, GEOG, GINT, HIST, PSYC, SOCY, WOST 112	3	6	
	Natural Sciences, e.g., ASTR, BIOL, CHEM, GEOG 201/202, GEOL, MSCI, PHYS, WOST 113	3	7	
	Electives	<u>33</u>	<u>32</u>	3
	TOTAL	60	60	

II. Cumulative 2.0 GPR

III. 15 Semester hours earned at USC-Union

Notes: 1. Corresponds to USC-Columbia Core and satisfies SACS requirements that each degree "must include competence in...writing...skills."

2. Corresponds to USC-Columbia Core and satisfies SACS requirement that each degree "must include competence in...math...skills."

3. Offers maximum flexibility for those students planning to continue toward a baccalaureate degree (e.g., BADM, ENGR).

HFS/mjr

REPORT OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR
FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
USC-Salkehatchie
February 17, 1989

Continuing Discussion of CHE Assessment Guidelines

You will recall that shortly after the November Senate meeting
a furor developed. It became apparent to post-secondary institu-
tions in South Carolina that the Commission on Higher Education
was about to enact at its November meeting a set of guidelines for
assessment which would force institutions to have such programs
operational within approximately one-year's time. This timetable,
of course, is much more draconian than that involved in our own
accreditation review process. Due primarily to concerted efforts
of the University's central administration including an emergency
meeting of the System Committee, extensive lobbying, and a spec-
tacular personal presentation before CHE by our new Provost, Art
Smith, the matter was deferred for 60 days. Provost Smith has
continued leading the state institutional efforts to have a more
reasonable timetable developed and adopted by the Commission.

At its February meeting, CHE adopted a revised set of guidelines
and timetables which shall be circulated by this Office to the
Senate leadership and administrative personnel on our Campuses.

Legislative Appreciation Day

A task force has been appointed (on which the University Campuses
are represented by David Hunter and John Gardner) to plan a System
Legislative Appreciation Day which will be held Wednesday,
April 12. I cannot inform you at this time of the tentative plans
because they are still early in the discussion stages. At the
very least there will be a large reception for several thousand
people at the Coliseum on Wednesday evening. As the name implies,
the overall objective is to express our appreciation to the
members of the General Assembly.

AAHE Symposium on Faculty Governance

One of the nation's largest professional associations for higher
education faculty and administrative personnel is the American
Association for Higher Education. This year, at its annual
meeting in Chicago, they will offer for the first time a special
pre-conference meeting entitled "The Symposium on Faculty
Governance," April 1-2. This will feature speeches, discussion
groups, and working sessions specially designed for faculty senate
chairs. This Office will underwrite the attendance of both our
current Chair and the Chair-Elect. We hope that this is helpful
to our Senate leadership.

Freshman Year Experience Conference

This conference convenes, literally, only hours after this document will be read on February 17. However, it is not too late for you or any of your faculty colleagues to attend if you wish to do so. If you have not preregistered, simply arrive at the Radisson Hotel and we will register you. Bring along a travel authorization for my action and this Office will support your participation.

Faculty Exchange

For Summer 1989, seven University Campuses faculty will be the recipients of Faculty Exchange Program grants. Virtually everyone who applied from the University Campuses this year was funded. I continue to be impressed with the meritoriousness of these proposals.

Title III

This Office is again strongly encouraging campuses to pursue their pursuit of Title III funding. The federally sponsored programs for "developing institutions" which are literally changing the face of two of our Campuses, USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Lancaster. Colleagues from the other three Campuses are urged to visit those institutions to see exactly what a Title III grant can do. We are again retaining an external consultant, Dr. James Olliver of Pfeiffer College and providing assistance centrally for the final production of the grant documents themselves. Current recipients, USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Lancaster, have set high standards for the rest of us to emulate.

Action by USC-Spartanburg Faculty Senate

This matter raises issues which are similar to the matter of System articulation problems encountered by our students as addressed by Chancellor Duffy in his report. Similarly, Spartanburg Senate action requesting permission to change the policy on which GPA is calculated (currently a standard System procedure) was referred by the Provost to the Academic Planning Committee which is a System committee and which subsequently recommended to the Provost that the Spartanburg Senate action not be endorsed. Similarly, Provost Smith has referred our concerns about student articulation problems to the Academic Planning Committee. The University Campuses are represented on this committee by Professor Bruce Nims of USC-Lancaster. This is an extremely important task, to understate the matter.

Representation on Columbia Faculty Senate

For this body's information I would like to point out that the Columbia Faculty Senate By-Laws do not allow for Alternate representation. A "substitute" representative may attend for informational purposes in the absence of an elected Senator but that representative does not assume the voting/speaking rights of the Senator.

REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR
FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
USC-Salkehatchie
February 17, 1989

Probably the most important task facing our Campuses in the next
year is the ongoing Self-Study. I am very pleased to announce
that the Campuses' individual mission statements have been
reviewed by the Core Committee and that in only a few cases have
minor changes been suggested. I hope that the mission statements
and the goal statements will be finished before this month is out.
Each Campus has committees to deal with the issues and my Office
will be available for assistance. If you have specific questions
about the Self-Study, contact Jim Edwards (7-4800), Associate
Chancellor, or David Bell (7-6455), who is the Administrative
Director of the Self-Study in Columbia.

I would also like to comment on the Commission on Higher
Education's consideration of TEC's request for college-parallel
programs at the nine TEC campuses which do not currently have
them. This issue is currently being discussed by Mr. Sheheen,
Dr. Morris, and Dr. Holderman. Dr. Holderman has stated very
clearly that the University of South Carolina will not give up any
campus of The USC System. There are many options being considered.
I really can't say more than I have said above but I can assure
you, however, that nothing has yet been agreed upon. We have been
advised by the Commission to hold off on our Twig proposals until
this TEC issue has been resolved.

Recently, John Gardner and I visited the Chair of the Commission,
Jack Whitener. We had a very full discussion of the issues facing
the University and the Commission at this time.

The House Ways and Means Committee is currently considering the
University's budget request. The chairman of the subcommittee is
talking in terms of 93% of full formula at this time. The most
optimistic estimates that I have heard for the final budget are
in the range of 95%. There are several one-time-only requests
including USC's request for $14,000,000 to match a grant from a
major computer manufacturer for an academic computing center in
Columbia. There is also a request from Clemson for approximately
$10,000,000 to buy a CRAY computer.

Susan Bridwell of Telecommunications Instruction would like some
University Campuses faculty input on a new brochure which has been
put together by Telecommunications Instruction and the College of
Applied Professional Sciences describing the possibilities for
securing a BAIS degree using television and correspondence courses
in addition to our regular courses. If any of you are interested
in reviewing a draft of the brochure, I will have several available
for your perusal.

In addition, we are proposing that IBM provide, in addition to the 50% discount, about $3 million per year to help fund researchers, and to attract scientists to our state. This center would be designated as a National IBM Supercomputer Center and would result in untold publicity, interest, and noteworthy national attention. There is no telling what the result would be for economic development, but states like Texas, Illinois, and Georgia indicate the results have been truly significant.

What's the Hurry?

The opportunity to participate in this may not last much longer. IBM indicates that it must move on establishing about five or six centers like this one around the United States. If The University of South Carolina does not seize upon this, the offer could be withdrawn and offered to other prestigious higher education institutions.

But won't this hurt formula funding?

The $14 million being requested would come from the surplus funds anticipated for the 1988-89 fiscal year. Estimates of that surplus range from $60 million to over $100 million. The $14 million that would clearly make The University of South Carolina a major player in the National computer scene, appears a relatively inexpensive investment that can do so much for our state. Formula funding, on the other hand, comes from recurring budgets, and not from one-time money such as the budget surplus. Funding for this computer would not detract from the dollars available for formula funding for 1989-90.

But USC already acquired a "supercomputer" last year.

Yes, but that computer allows for experimental, not administrative uses of computing technology. American universities must be working on technologies that are 3, 5, and even 10 years into the future. The Gemini Massively Parallel computer at USC is already beginning to show results and will complement the large IBM supercomputer because the two together would provide researchers with a rich array of computing facilities, using whichever meets their needs best.

Did USC go through the CHE for this computer system?

Yes. The University of South Carolina did submit its request through the normal funding request process in 1988. The only thing different now relates to this new opportunity from IBM that could not be anticipated last year. Therefore, the request is now $14 million, instead of the previous $8 million.

Are there recurring costs?

Yes. All computer systems require ongoing maintenance and support. However, The University of South Carolina has already established a major infrastructure of computing support services. The added new costs of operating this largest IBM computer anywhere would be about $3.6 million. When viewed as $3.6 million out of a $500 million higher education budget, it does not loom large when one measures the outstanding opportunity such a computer system means to our state.

2/15/89

FACTSHEET ON THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA SUPERCOMPUTER PLAN

Background

About three years ago, the National Science Foundation established five National Supercomputer Centers. These centers were established near five of the most prestigious universities in the country: Cornell, Illinois, University of Pittsburgh/Carnegie Mellon, University of California/San Diego, and Princeton University.

Since that time, many major universities throughout the United States have funded supercomputer centers. These include University of California/Berkeley, University of Texas, Alabama, Florida State, North Carolina, Ohio State, and The University of Georgia. Having a supercomputer center in one's state is important for several reasons: (1) to help attract high quality faculty and graduate students who need the power of these computers to attack advanced research problems, (2) to gain a national presence as one of the finer universities in the US that has such advanced computing facilities, and (3) to allow that same national prominence in research to help attract industrial firms to locate and develop infrastructure in South Carolina.

So What's New?

Until the NSF initiative, supercomputers were bought only for large governmental research labs and a few large oil companies. Because the market for such computers was not large, only two American companies, Cray and Control Data Corporation (CDC) built and sold such machines. IBM did not see this market as attractive a decade ago. But about two years ago, IBM decided that the time was right to compete in this market. They developed a very capable and cost effective approach to supercomputing which was different from all others: IBM built supercomputer capability into its standard line of computers. In this way, an IBM supercomputer can be used for normal computing functions such as student access, accounting, student records processing , as well as very demanding, large scale, scientific calculations.

Because of the significant research work and excellent faculty at The University of South Carolina, IBM is desirous of locating its largest computer system at The University of South Carolina. In addition, IBM hopes to fund faculty and scientists within South Carolina to help develop new software or modify existing software to operate on the IBM computer. The new computer system could also help The University of South Carolina and The Development Board in creating a stronger partnership with Research & Development divisions of South Carolina companies. Company scientists and university scientists could jointly work toward important commercial processes.

So What's the Cost?

The University of South Carolina has been planning to upgrade its present, aging, and overloaded computer system. In fact, USC included about $8 million for this purpose within USC's supplemental funding request that went to The Commission on Higher Education in September 1988. That request has not yet been acted upon, but is pending legislative action.

Within the past few months, IBM has offered USC this very large computer system (**the largest IBM computer system in the world**). IBM is willing to provide a 50% discount on this computer which has a list price of $28 million. That is, for $14 million, we could purchase a $28 million computer IBM's normal educational discount is between 15% and 25%, so this would be an enormous savings.