

**UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE**

**September 21, 1990**

**USC-Columbia**

**Informal Session**

Chair Nancy Washington opened the Senate meeting by welcoming everyone present to the 23rd year of the University Campuses Faculty Senate. Professor Washington extended a special welcome to the new senators and alternates as well as the following guests: Vice Chancellor for University Campuses and Continuing Education, Professor John N. Gardner; Associate Chancellor for Planning and Special Projects, Mr. James W. Edwards; Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Mr. David Hunter; Ms. Susan Bridwell, Dean of Telecommunications Instruction and Independent Learning; Ms. Mary M. Derrick; Ms. Mary Kay Hall. Professor John Gardner explained that Chancellor Duffy was meeting with several of the University Vice Presidents on a CHE matter and that the Chancellor would join the Senate later in the day.

The Vice Chancellor's written report was distributed, as well as, the first edition of Information for New Senators which was compiled on behalf of the Executive Committee by Professor Washington and Dr. Deborah Cureton, immediate past-Chair of the Senate. The officers of the Senate for the 1990-91 academic year were introduced as follows: Professor Nancy Washington, Chair from Lifelong Learning; Dr. Cureton from Lancaster, who could not be present at the meeting; Professor Rick Boulware, Vice-Chair from USC-Beaufort; Dr. Carolyn West, Secretary from USC-Sumter.

Interim President Arthur K. Smith was invited to address the Senate. He began by welcoming everyone to the new academic year. He commented that this should be an interesting and exciting year and one in which budgets would be very tight. University Campuses may be especially aware of this since they have actually had to reduce fees this year because of the Holderman-Morris TEC Articulation agreement and this is also a year of very low Formula Funding. President Smith characterized this year as a transition year in that we are in the midst of a Presidential search. He also characterized the University as being on the brink of the last decade for the count-down to the year 2001 in which the 200th birthday of the University will be celebrated. He cited the visitation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for the reaffirmation of accreditation as differing this year because University Campuses are not going through the process as separate institutions but as part of USC-Columbia. He said that this was being done because University Campuses are not reaccreditable as Level 1 institutions because of the variety of programs offered on University Campuses at this time. Additional events in the coming

year that President Smith felt would make this an interesting year included: the submission in December by CHE of a statewide plan which will be preceded in October by hearings around the state; the unity of the Council of Presidents in attempting to combat declining support in funding for higher education in the state of South Carolina; and an effort on the part of the University to improve relations with the CHE which hopefully will be met with a similar posture from the esteemed coordinating board. President Smith concluded by responding to a variety of questions from the senators.

The Chair called for reports from the Campus Deans.

Dean Chris Plyler (Beaufort) began by discussing the renovation progress of the old Beaufort Elementary School which has been refurbished by USC-Beaufort. He reported that the campus is in the classrooms in the building and they expect that the Performing Arts Center will be operational by the month of December. A Title III award has been received by the Beaufort Campus and the new director is Lee Shafer, who has been with the campus in a part-time capacity in the curriculum lab. The grant begins on October 1, 1990 and the director is currently developing a policy and procedures manual. Enrollment is up despite a drop in military enrollment by 40% because of deployment of military in the Beaufort area to Saudi Arabia. The headcount and FTE are up 2.2% and 6% respectively. The campus is revitalizing ties to the USC Educational Foundation which should provide monies for equipment, faculty development and instructional activities which the operational funds are unable to support at this time. Dean Plyler concluded by introducing the delegation from the Beaufort Campus as follows: Professors Rick Boulware, Rod Sproatt, Ellen Chamberlain, John Blair, Jane Upshaw, Gordon Haist.

Dean Pete Arnold (Lancaster) reported that the Campus's Faculty Retreat was again instructive and informative. Enrollment figures indicate that the number of full-time students has increased at Lancaster and the campus now has over 500 students in the category for the first time. The renovation of Hubbard Hall is in the final stages. The completion of the Title III project will result in the continuance of some of the activities and programs initiated through the grant. Dr. Deborah Cureton has been appointed to the newly created office of Director of Academic Support Services. The completion of the Self-Study is a priority of the moment. The Shady Grove Band was scheduled for the evening of September 21, 1990 at 8 pm. Dean Arnold then introduced the Lancaster delegation: Professors Susan Pauly, Danny Faulkner, Ralph Garris, Noni Bohonak, Kay Chanasar, John Catalano, Wade Chittam, and Bruce Nims.

Dean John May (Lifelong Learning) opened by introducing Professor Nancy Washington, Dean Sally Boyd, Professors John Stine, Jerry Dockery, Linda Holderfield, David Hunter, Stuart Hunter, Mike

Schoen, David Bowden, and Linda Allman. Enrollment is essentially the same as last year. A new venture, Neighborhood Courses, is taking courses to the areas of the city, such as Richland Northeast area and the Irmo area, for eight-week sessions. It is hoped that similar offerings can be made available in the West Columbia area for the spring.

Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs Frank Shelton (Salkehatchie) reported a 9% increase in FTE and a 13% increase in headcount. The Governor was on campus recently for a reception connected with the dove shoot. The construction of the new library building is planned to be completed in March. A 25th Anniversary Celebration is scheduled for November 11-17 with activities planned for Salkehatchie and Walterboro. The delegation was introduced as: Professors Bill Bowers, Milton Harden, Susan Moskow, Sandra Willis and Ali Pyarali.

Dean Tom Lisk (Sumter) reported enrollments were up slightly even though the campus experienced a loss of 40 FTE due to military deployments. A positive aspect of this loss was the recognition that such can occur without significant impact to the total FTE. The highest priority of the year is to continue to seek funding for the library addition. The campus is looking forward to hosting the Senate meeting during the month of November. Dean Lisk introduced the following members of the Sumter delegation: Professors John Logue, Carolyn West, Robert Costello, Robert Castleberry, John Safford, Nancy MacDonald, Charlie Cook, Richard Bell, Jean Gray, and Sal Macias.

Dean Ken Davis (Union) recognized the Senate delegation from Union as follows: Professors Mary Barton, John Wright, Dan Snow and Tandy Willis. The Union campus also is celebrating a 25th anniversary this year and has numerous activities planned including a visit from Carolina Alive. Enrollments are also up about 10% over last fall and Laurens enrollment doubled in both headcount and FTE.

The Chair recognized Mr. Jim Edwards and asked for a progress report concerning the Self-Study. Mr. Edwards indicated that almost everyone in the room was involved in the Self-Study process on their individual campuses. The deadline for the rough draft is October 1.

The meeting continued with standing committee meetings. The Grievance Committee was instructed to meet and elect a Chair for the year.

## GENERAL SESSION

### **I. Call to Order**

Chair Washington opened the session by thanking Chancellor Duffy for the very nice lunch and welcoming him to the afternoon session. Professor Tandy Willis has been asked to serve as Parliamentarian for the year.

### **II. Correction/Approval of Minutes**

The Chair asked for additions or corrections to the Minutes of the April 13, 1990 meeting in Beaufort. There being none, the Minutes were approved as presented.

### **III. Reports from University Officers**

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

Dr. Duffy opened with comments on the 1991-92 budget outlook which he characterized as grim. The state will not meet its budget projections and the outlook will continue to be poor as a result. The budget process will begin shortly. Interim President Smith will begin visits to campuses with Sumter (October 2), Lancaster (October 11), Beaufort (October 15), Union (October 16) and Salkehatchie (October 23). The format for Interim President Smith's visit will be similar to the Presidential visits in the past and will include time for meetings with the public, faculty, and students. The fall enrollments, while not reflecting great increases, are pleasing in that they do not include the shortfalls that had been projected. The Columbia enrollment for freshmen is down but enrollments have been maintained due to the number of transfers than have come into the System. The graduate enrollments appear to be down though the enrollments for these programs were up for the summer.

A paper presented at the System Retreat in Aiken, Coopers and Lybrand Exposure Draft, deals with the question of direct charges to campuses. The report is critical in some respects and the Library Processing Center has submitted a response to the report. Dr. Duffy hopes that the result will be a much stronger and a more rationally organized system.

The Family Fund Campaign has commenced on each campus.

Concerning the Chancellor's activities during the morning session, Dr. Duffy explained that CHE gave to the Council of Presidents the state plan which the Commission has been working on since the beginning of the year. The plan deals

with critical issues in higher education in the state. Previously, such plans have been in a developmental phase with nearly a year for input from committees including representatives from the public and business community. Input was also solicited from the political sector of the state and the from academia in the preparation of such plans in the past. In short, in the past an attempt was made to produce a broadly-based document. Dr. Duffy reported that the current document was produced exclusively by staff members of CHE. The experience of CHE staff members is primarily at the community college-level. The documents making up the current plan are geared toward collecting of data which will be reposed in CHE. Similar data had been collected up to about five years ago but the data were never used. These documents will result in data again being collected. Another part of the plan addresses the sequestering of money for The Cutting Edge. This money, about \$30 million off the top, would reduce the net spending for higher education. For instance, if the plan were carried out for the current funding year the amount being received by institutions would be reduced from 86% to 83%. Another issue in the plan is enrollment capping. The commission staff does not envision capping the enrollment of community colleges. Dr. Duffy emphasized that the critical issue is one of governance. CHE is asking the institutions of higher education in the state to trade off governance for rewards from CHE. The public meetings will be held at six locations during the month of October. USC will be asking advocates for the University to attend these meetings. CHE's hierarchical view of the universe results in their failure to thoroughly understand faculty governance as the essence of a university. Further, in a time when the world is moving away from centralized decision making, CHE is espousing processes which will result in increasing the staff of CHE and increasing the number of reports which must be written for CHE. These efforts will be couched in terms to win the sentiments of the legislature and public, namely, under the cloak of access and equity. Data exists to indicate that minority students entering four-year institutions have a greater chance of graduating than students entering two-year institutions. Specifically, at USC when the Class of 1983 was tracked for degree-seeking students, 25% had graduated. This is about twice the percentage seen at two year campuses.

Dr. Duffy concluded by opening the floor to questions.

Senator Rod Sproatt inquired about the recurring tendency of the CHE to exceed the responsibilities associated with a coordinating board and to function more as a board of regents without legislative mandate. He questioned when the higher education institutions, perhaps through the Council of Presidents, will say "enough is enough." Dr. Duffy responded that the Council of Presidents and chief academic officers are

currently responding to this issue. The strengths and weaknesses of the California System were discussed since CHE has been advocating the adoption of a similar system in South Carolina. It was stated that California is expanding its senior institutions while the community college system is considered a welfare system.

Senator Ellen Chamberlain asked about the mission statements which were modified as a result of CHE suggestions. She wondered if we had heard anything about whether those statements have been accepted. Dr. Duffy, upon confirmation with Mr. Jim Edwards, replied that there had not been a response from CHE concerning those statements but that the statements had been approved by the Board of Trustees. As an aside, Dr. Duffy found remarkable that the state plan does not even address distance education. Senator Chamberlain asked how CHE would treat University Campuses when they are Level 2 through 4 institutions as a result of this reaccreditation. Dr. Duffy responded that he did not know. CHE does not really care what SACS sees University Campuses as.

After extended comments by Dr. Duffy concerning the aspirations of CHE in areas such as auxiliary funds, sports programs and foundation funds, he encouraged everyone to educate and inform others concerning the methods, attitudes and unfulfilled longings of the Commission and its leaders.

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

Professor Gardner indicated that he had nothing to add to his written report except to commend those responsible for the booklet Information for New Senators. Professor Washington indicated that the booklet had been the idea of Dr. Deborah Cureton and if any senators had suggestions for improvement to please submit them to the Executive Committee.

**IV. Reports from Standing Committees**

**A. Rights and Responsibilities -- Professor Gordon Haist (Beaufort)**

Professor John Logue stated that the Rights and Responsibilities Committee had elected Professor Gordon Haist as the new chairman and Professor Danny Faulkner as secretary. Professor Jerry Dockery reported on progress of the Faculty Manual Revision Committee. The latest addition to the Manual is a totally revised Grievance Procedure as a result of actions by last year's Grievance Committee which was under the direction of Professor Linda Holderfield. The changes were in response to needs to protect faculty during the grievance process. The procedure is improved in clarity as a result of work by

Professors Dockery, Holderfield and Gardner as well as Dean Sally Boyd and Mr. Don Carter.

Considerable discussion followed concerning whether the Grievance Procedure could be discussed at this meeting. Professor Dockery discussed the changes in the revised Grievance Procedure. The major change was the incorporation of the definition of "a day." Professor Robert Castleberry inquired about the intent of the statement "and approved by this body" in the section concerning the faculty unit vote. Professor Dockery indicated that the composition of the Grievance Committee at the System-level was open to approval by the Faculty Senate. Professor Washington indicated that the Senate had never voted to accept the membership of the committee. The Senate has accepted the membership of the committee as constituted. Professor Castleberry pressed the point that the procedure indicates a vote of approval of the Senate. Professor John Logue indicated that the intent of the procedure was that the Senate accept the composition of the committee as elected by the individual campuses. Professor Dockery continued with a description of the Grievance Procedure as revised. He stated that another change was in the section on "Actions Subject to Appeal." The actions which can be grieved include, but are not limited to, the following: denial of tenure, denial of promotion, non-reappointment, dismissal of tenured faculty members, dismissal of contract employees prior to the conclusion of a contract term, discrimination in compensation, promotion or work assignment and any other form of discrimination or unfair treatment. Procedures for grieving each of these issues are then explained as indicated in Attachment 1. The significant changes in the procedures for grieving each of the issues concerned the number of days for actions to be taken by the grievant to request a written summary for actions taken in denial of tenure or promotion and the number of days in which the Dean has to respond to the request for summaries and copies of documents in such a case. The changes in the number of days allowed for these actions were to bring the procedure in line with the policy as dictated by the Board of Trustees. The number of days in which the Chancellor has to respond and act were also changed to mesh with those of Board policy. Professor Dockery continued by reading the revised procedure indicating that Professor Holderfield had been especially effective in developing the procedures permitted and suggested if the grievance comes before the System Grievance Committee. These procedures pertain to the following in reviewing the petition: the time, place and procedure to be used in reviewing the petition will be communicated to the grievant, the recording of the procedure for the use of the committee only, the permissibility of having an advisor during the procedure, and the committee assistance in securing individuals for pertinent testimony. Professor Dockery continued

the reading of the revised Grievance Procedure as printed in Attachment 1 of the minutes.

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter) inquired if there were any problems with the Grievance Procedure as presented for members of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Hearing none, Professor Castleberry moved that the rules be suspended to permit a vote on the approval of the Grievance Procedure. The motion was seconded. The motion passed by greater than two-thirds of the members present.

The Rights and Responsibilities Committee then moved that the revised Grievance Procedure be adopted. A second was not required because the motion came from committee. The motion passed.

Professor Washington inquired when the revised Manual would be available to the senators. Professor Dockery replied that the Manual will be available the day after the Deans finish their review of the document. Professor Washington expressed the desire not to be confronted with an entire Manual for review and approval at the November meeting. Professor Gardner reminded the body that the Senate had approved the Manual in April. Professor Dockery indicated that Professor Haist has made a motion at the April meeting that was to insure that senators would be informed of any changes and the rationale for any changes to the document which was approved in April.

The Rights and Responsibilities Committee expressed the opinion that the tenure and promotion procedure needs to be revised next year. In order to collect more information on the need to revise these procedures, the Rights and Responsibilities Committee passed the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION:** Be it resolved that when the local Tenure and Promotion Committees meet this fall, the members should discuss any shortcomings that they see in the present system. Their recommendations and concerns should be forwarded to their representatives to the System Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Be it also resolved that the System T & P Committee, when it meets this winter, should also meet again on the following day to discuss these concerns and to formulate recommendations for changes in the t & p procedure. These recommendations should be forwarded to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee before the February meeting so that revisions may be presented to the full Senate at that time, to be acted upon at the April meeting.



After a motion to support the resolution, considerable discussion ensued concerning what the Senate can do to influence tenure and promotion procedures on the individual campuses. Professor John Gardner emphasized that the Senate has considerable power in influencing the unit committees through the procedure in the Faculty Manual. Professor John Logue responded to concerns that the committee resolution was an attempt to control and change t & p procedures on local campuses. Professor Logue said that the intent of the resolution was to address the concern of many faculty that at the System and local level the faculty are not supplying very much input in the T & P decisions. The faculty have been essentially acting as a jury and send forth a vote on a file. The vote is the only comment the faculty has on a file and all that the Chancellor receives from the faculty on a particular file. Often this results in decisions at the local and System level being overturned when reviewed by the Chancellor because no justifications or information about the vote of the committee are supplied. The resolution is an attempt to begin a study on how to include greater influence in the T & P process in order to make it a more meaningful peer evaluation. Professor Gardner added that his written report attempted to address this problem by indicating that the T & P votes have been coming forward for years now with no written justifications of the vote. Professor Gardner strongly urged the faculty to apply the criteria in the Faculty Manual for promotion and tenure and then to explain why they have voted as they have. If this is not done, the candidate is placed at a strong disadvantage in seeking promotion or tenure because the voice of the faculty is not heard fully. The final decision, without an explanation of the vote of the faculty, is restricted to administrative commentary and lacks an explanation of why the faculty voted as they did. All other faculty units in the University provide commentary except University Campuses and there is nothing prohibiting our campuses doing so.

The resolution was voted on and passed unanimously.

Annual faculty evaluations on the campuses will also be a concern of the Rights and Responsibilities Committee this year. Professor Gardner commented that an annual evaluation for all employees below the level of professor is a state law and if any campus is not receiving such evaluations the Chancellor's Office should be notified immediately.

A motion to suspend the Order of the Agenda to permit the presentation of a resolution honoring Dean Sid Varney of the College of Applied Professional Sciences was seconded and carried.

**V. New Business**

After introductory remarks introducing Dean Sid Varney and his colleagues from the College of Applied Professional Sciences, Professors Richard Mims and Don Stowe, the Chair asked the Secretary of the Senate to read the resolution.

**RESOLUTION:** The University Campuses Faculty Senate wishes to take this occasion to honor Dr. Harry E. Varney for his support of the University Campuses over two decades. Sid Varney has been Dean of the College of Applied Professional Sciences since 1972. As Dean, he has demonstrated a genuine interest in the welfare of students and faculty on the University Campuses. The Executive Committee of the University Campuses Faculty Senate presents the following resolution:

Whereas, Dr. Harry E. Varney designed the original Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies degree program and was instrumental in its implementation on the University Campuses, and

Whereas, his actions have displayed an understanding of the unique needs of non-traditional students at the University Campuses, and

Whereas, he has eagerly supported the course offerings on the University Campuses in the Office Administration, Retailing and Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism Administration curricula, and

Whereas, he has generously shared equipment, furniture, and other surplus goods with the University Campuses, and

Whereas, he has consistently provided advisement for Columbia-bound System students,

Therefore be it resolved that the University Campuses Faculty Senate recognizes and honors Dr. Harry E. Varney in appreciation for his many kindnesses in support of the University Campuses and their students.

The motion to accept this resolution did not require a second as it had come out of the Executive Committee. The resolution was unanimously passed. Dr. Varney thanked the Senate by commenting on the success of the BAIS degree over the years and recognizing that several others also deserve recognition for their contributions to the success of the degree. He acknowledged the contributions of Tom Davis, Jay Fitzgerald, Richard Mims, and Don Stowe. He thanked these individuals for

making it possible for him to receive this honor and he thanked the Senate for the honor.

The Senate then returned to Reports from Standing Committees.

**IV. B. Welfare -- Professor Mary Barton (Union)**

Professor Barton expressed appreciation to Professor Susan Pauly for being willing to take on the responsibility of taking notes in the meeting and thus assisting Professor Barton in preparing a report for the Senate. Professor Barton then read the following report from the Welfare Committee:

The Welfare Committee discussed the variations in over-load payment among the different University Campuses. As not all the necessary information was available, it was decided that the committee members would gather this data so that a more complete comparison may be made at our next meeting.

An information sheet of salary data was provided from the Chronicle of Higher Education (September 5, 1990). This salary information may be useful to this committee in it's ongoing monitoring of the faculty salaries and provide yet another basis of comparison.

The other committee charge regarding the consideration of a workshop to raise consciousness of the problems of new faculty in their integration into the community, was extensively discussed. It was decided that this may be a local concern that could be more effectively dealt with on an informal basis. The committee requests the local Welfare Committees to consider this issue for their campuses.

Finally, Professor Dockery made a report regarding fringe benefits. This information is much appreciated as it is an important issue for faculty welfare.

**C. System Affairs Committee -- Professor John Catalano (Lancaster)**

Professor John Catalano reported that the System Affairs Committee was charged with

1. Looking at the Visiting Scholars Program
2. Discussing the need for a faculty development manual
3. To encourage meetings by discipline

4. To look at articulation problems again this year

Professor Catalano then read the following report from the committee.

Charlie Cook and Mike Schoen have volunteered to coordinate the Visiting Scholars Program. They will collect information from the campus representatives and forward that information to Dr. Duffy's office for distribution.

We feel that Visiting Scholars Program, meetings by discipline, announcement of colloquia, as well as faculty resource and/or development information should be included in an electronic bulletin board which should be online at all campuses. We would be able to keep this information more current and costs would be less in the long run (e.g. printing and mail charges).

We will monitor articulation problems and report them to the Senate as well as the System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee. We in the System Affairs Committee strongly support the work of this committee and suggest renewed vigor. We would especially like to see the System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee examine the 300-level business course developments and would also like to request a report from the Chancellor's office to the System Affairs Committee concerning what we are doing to counter these developments.

Professor Catalano then moved in behalf of the committee the following motion:

**MOTION:** For approval of the core curriculum of the A.A. and A.S. degrees on the USC-Lancaster campus (Attachment 2).

The core curriculum was approved with the parenthetical (may be changed to twelve) under the number of hours required in residence, deleted.

**VI. Executive Committee -- Dr. Carolyn West (Sumter)**

Professor West reported that the Executive Committee had met in a retreat August 5-7, 1990 to formulate goals and assignments for the standing committees. The Executive Committee also met September 7. The Senate was reminded that money may be designated for the Ada Thomas Scholarship as part of the Family Fund drive. The fund was opened last year with a contribution of \$500 but the fund must accrue \$5000 before a scholarship may be awarded. The brochure publicizing the activities of the University Campuses is in preparation. An

effort is being made to increase exposure of the University Campuses in the USC-Times.

**VII. Reports of Special Committees**

**A. Library Committee -- Professor John Catalano (Lancaster)**

There was no report from the Library Committee as the committee has not met.

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

Professor Castleberry requested feedback after the meeting on a course that has come through the committee, MUED 154, a one hour course which will be a pre-requisite for MUED 454. He would like to know how this will affect our campuses?

Religion 373-Religion in the South is a proposed new course.

English is revising their curriculum with most of the changes at the 400 level.

Changes of an editorial nature have been made to MSCI 302.

These changes should be acted upon in the next meeting of the Columbia Faculty Senate.

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

Professor Carolyn West reported that Professor Curlovic had no report.

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

Professor Nims reported that the Academic Planning Committee held its first meeting of the 1990-91 academic year on September 19, with new chair Dan Sabia presiding. Also attending were Provost George Reeves and Associate Provost John Olsgaard. There was a discussion of the committee's role and potential duties for the year. Out of that discussion came the proposal that the Academic Planning Committee might have a role in advising the President concerning the self-study and planning documents now being generated by the various units within the USC System. The committee will be

inviting Self-Study Coordinator David Bell to meet with it in October to discuss with him an appropriate role for the committee in the evaluation of planning document.

**E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee -- Professor Kay Oldhouser (Sumter)**

Professor Rod Sproatt reported the committee met twice over the summer. The committee approved the offering of the MAT degree in early childhood education and the establishment of a Medical Ethics Center in the Philosophy Department.

**F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee -- Professor B. H. Carraway (Lancaster)**

Professor Noni Bohonak reported that the committee has not met. There was no report.

**G. Savannah River Site Committee -- Professor Bill Lamprecht (Salkehatchie)**

There was no report.

**H. System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee -- Professor Robert Costello (Sumter)**

Professor Costello reported that the System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee last met on April 24, 1990. The primary order of business was to review recommendations on degree requirement policy presented by Dr. Opal Brown on behalf of the USC-Columbia Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee. These recommendations dealt with clarification of the new System policy that "An undergraduate student may choose to obtain a degree in accordance with the curricular requirements in force for the particular degree at the time the student first enrolls in matriculated status at any campus of the USC System..."

Recommendation 1, that the policy be applied retroactively to all students currently enrolled as baccalaureate degree-seeking students, with exceptions reflected in the remaining recommendations, was approved.

Recommendation 2, that the term in matriculated status be changed to as a baccalaureate degree-seeking student was approved with the recommendation that associate degree candidates be included in the category of baccalaureate degree-seeking students.

Recommendation 3, that the time allowed to claim the rights of a specific bulletin regarding curricula requirements for graduation be reduced from eight to six

years did not receive majority support; it was supported only by USC-Columbia faculty representatives.

Recommendation 4, that the time allowed to be absent and still claim the rights of a specific bulletin be reduced from five to two years was discussed extensively with a consensus favoring the compromise of three years rather than two or five.

On May 31, 1990, members of the System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee were notified that the USC-Columbia Faculty Senate had adopted requirements for graduation consistent with the Committee's actions on recommendations 2 through 4: the terminology change to baccalaureate degree-seeking students and the 8-year and 3-year provisions.

The System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee will continue its activities this year with meetings planned for October and November. Please communicate your concerns and suggestions regarding System academic policies through your University Campuses representatives on the committee: Vice Chancellor Gardner, Professor Washington, and Professor Costello.

**I. University Insurance Committee -- Professor Jerry Dockery (Lifelong Learning)**

Professor Dockery reported that the Prudential Group Life Plan will issue a new table of benefits. The premiums will not increase. Disability insurance from Jefferson Pilot may be renegotiated with another company. Professor Dockery recommended that anyone having more than 1350 sick leave hours should consider filling out a P-71 Leave Transfer Form. The form must be in the personnel office by December 1. On January 1, anyone having more than 1350 sick leave hours will automatically lose them and this is a way to make them available to someone who may have a need for them. This and other matters are more fully covered in Attachment 3 of the minutes.

**VIII. Unfinished Business**

There was no unfinished business.

**IX. New Business**

The new business was complete with the presentation to Dean Varney.

**X. Announcements**

Linda Holderfield was elected Chair of the Grievance Committee for this year. A Systemwide fishing tournament is being held in Beaufort on October 20, 1990. An academic day for psychology majors will be held and Professor Castleberry had flyers available announcing this activity. The Administrative Employees Club is sponsoring a golf tournament at Beech Creek Golf Club on October 3 and representatives on each campus have information concerning the tournament. The South Carolina Writer's Forum will sponsor at USC-Sumter at 12:00 noon a lecture by Dori Sanders, the author of Clover. The lecture is free and open to the public.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



REPORT OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR  
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

TO THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

SEPTEMBER 21, 1990  
COLUMBIA

STATUS OF BAIS DEGREE PROPOSAL

You will recall that for several years there has been talk (from the perspective of this office) about the desirability of our campuses developing their own adult learner/non-traditional student baccalaureate degree. We turned this matter over to a committee of the University Campuses Faculty Senate two years ago and no action resulted. In the meantime, the College of Applied Professional Sciences has been under a mandate from CHE to submit for formal review its BAIS degree for the five University Campuses, said degree having been offered for over a decade for us. This office has been working with the College to prepare a draft of an "informal" proposal which will be submitted to CHE this fall. After their reaction it will be revised and in turn submitted for official review. Obviously, the fate of this proposal at the hands of CHE is critical to the upper-division course offering status of the University Campuses, let alone our continuing to make baccalaureate degree educational opportunities available in our communities. We anticipate the necessity of undertaking a CHE "educational campaign" as we did to have the business degree program approved in Beaufort. This office had discussed with the Executive Committee of this Senate the idea of continuing to develop our own proposal but we have decided that if the BAIS program is approved we couldn't possibly improve upon that degree. Naturally, we are extremely grateful to the College of Applied Professional Sciences for all that they have done over the years to make this degree possible. This is related, of course, to the recognition we are conferring upon Dean Varney of that unit at the September 21 meeting.

REVIEW OF GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

The five faculty senates in the University System are currently under a mandate from the USC Board of Trustees to revise their grievance procedures to address certain concerns which the Board has had. During the past academic year for the first time in the history of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, our grievance procedures were utilized by a faculty member. This meant we went from the hypothetical/theoretical to the actual use of these previously untested provisions. Based on the experience, with our Grievance Committee, and with the leadership of faculty members Professors Linda Holderfield, John Logue, and Jerry Dockery, with some assistance from this office, these procedures have been

revised in draft. This draft has been approved by the Legal Office and will be submitted to this body for your approval at this meeting. It is extremely important that we adopt these at this time. The faculty leadership is to be commended for the extremely thorough way in which they have handled this and for their great concern to safeguard the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of the faculty.

PUBLICITY ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FOR UNIVERSITY RELATIONS PUBLICATIONS

The office of University Relations has brought to the attention of this office their desire to increase significantly the attention and publicity given to University Campuses in such USC publications as USC Times. For a number of reasons we have not been receiving enough coverage in such publications. Therefore, this is to encourage you strongly to submit through the appropriate channels on your campus any information about faculty activities and accomplishments that you might wish to see recognized in USC media. University Relations, to understate the matter, is extremely solicitous of having such material. Naturally, this office is extremely appreciative of that sentiment.

USC SYSTEM ADMINISTRATORS RETREAT AT USC-AIKEN

August 12-14 saw the annual gathering of the USC System administrators on one of our System Campuses. A number of key issues were discussed including the very future of the USC System as we now know it. Ours is one of 34 public, multi-campus university systems in the United States and has the unique feature of allowing, due to the nature of the original legislative statutory enabling legislation, a campus to secede from the system if it wishes. Currently, an external consulting study is being undertaken by Coastal Carolina College to make recommendations as to whether or not that campus will remain in the System. In addition, there are a number of other contentions and strains which have been exacerbated by the University's bleak budgetary outlook. The System officers in the coming academic year will continue to debate the merits of centralized versus decentralized administrative procedures and in all probably greater efforts will be made to give the campuses greater autonomy for certain administrative procedures being initiated and completed on the campuses (e.g. purchasing). Another continuing debate will be priorities for acquisition of extremely expensive computing equipment and software technology--whether those investments should be made for administrative versus instructional purposes. This is an ongoing debate at campuses across the country. In addition, we face probably the greatest challenges to

our structural and financial integrity, from the CHE since the creation of that body in 1968. We have reason to believe that that coordinating body will take efforts this coming year to place severe restrictions on the ability of the University to continue to grow and expand to meet the needs of its natural constituencies. Information about this topic will be provided as it becomes available. Another key issue this year, of course, is the fact that we are operating at the lowest level of Formula funding since the State has used a formula to fund its higher education institutions (this year approximately 84% of formula). Another key concern facing the University this year, obviously, is the transition from one president to another; extremely able and facilitative leadership was provided by Interim President Smith at the Administrative Retreat and it is accurate to say that there was more participant discussion than had been characterized at previous meetings.

SYSTEM BUSINESS, PERSONNEL, COMPUTING, FACILITIES, LEGAL, SPAR OFFICERS RETREAT

This office will co-host the second annual University System retreat for Business, Personnel, Computing, Facilities, Legal, and SPAR Officers, November 30-December 2, in North Myrtle Beach. The key issue will be continuing discussion of recommendations of the Coopers Lybrand educational consulting group study of system administrative support services and the costs for same.

FACULTY EXCHANGE

Virtually every member of this body is aware of one of the most popular means of faculty development for the University Campuses, the now more than a decade old Faculty Exchange Program. You will be pleased to know that this FEP will operate this coming year with no cuts in available funds. The program is administered by the Office of the Provost and this office. Applications will be circulated shortly and I will take steps to see that you are properly notified of your opportunity to apply. Naturally, we urge you to take advantage of this wonderful opportunity.

NOVEMBER 9 VISIT FROM HARVARD ASSESSMENT SCHOLAR

This office will be co-sponsoring, in association with the Office of the Provost, a visit to the University from Harvard Professor of Education and Government, Richard Light. Professor Light chaired the process at Harvard which has received considerable national attention for assessing and determining outcomes of undergraduate students and especially the most effective teaching approaches for

achieving those outcomes. Professor Light will give a presentation on Friday, November 9. I will provide you subsequently with some of the particulars of this session which will be held at USC-Columbia. Our faculty are encouraged to attend.

#### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OFFICER SEARCH

Some of you will recall that at the February meeting of this body last year, there was a pointed discussion about the status of the Affirmative Action Officer Search, the committee for which having been chaired by the Vice Chancellor. The search committee had completed its last report to the President in October 1989; three finalists were interviewed by the President; and none were found acceptable. The search was not reopened prior to President Holderman's departure as the position fell victim to the hiring freeze spring semester 1990. President Smith has appointed a new search committee which will be chaired by Professor Aretha Pigford of the College of Education. This office will be represented on said committee by the Vice Chancellor. It is hoped that an individual will be appointed to this position mid-spring semester 1990. If you know of any individuals whom you believe might qualify for such a position, we eagerly welcome your soliciting their applications. Qualified applicants should have a minimum of a masters degree and four years experience in higher education affirmative action administrative activities.

#### JUSTIFICATIONS ON T&P BALLOTS

It has been the practice of the faculty on the University Campuses for years not to write individual justifications on the individual ballots in explanation of their votes of yes, no, abstain. This made it impossible for administrative reviewers (the Deans of the University Campuses, the Office of the Chancellor, and the President) and even your own University Campuses System Tenure and Promotion Committee to ascertain the rationale for the unit level voting. This office has discussed this practice which is starkly in contrast of the practice of the Columbia Campus and has gathered from the Office of the Provost and the System Legal Department, there is not only no reason why your ballots cannot and should not obtain written justifications, but it would be extremely desirable to have such information included on the ballots. Therefore, this office will work with the appropriate committee of this Senate to ask that provision for such written justifications be included in the revision of The Faculty Manual. Even without such a revision, the practice would be possible this coming fall. The System Legal Department has expressed its willingness to work with us to effect this important change which should further protect and safeguard

Report of the Vice Chancellor  
September 21, 1990  
Page 5

the rights of the faculty vis a vis securing tenure and promotion. It makes it much more difficult for administrative reviewing officers to ensure that faculty have been protected in a fair application of the published criteria for tenure and promotion without being able to determine whether or not faculty ballots have been cast in accordance with those published criteria.

## APPENDIX III

**GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE FOR THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES SYSTEM<sup>1</sup>**

## UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

## MEMBERSHIP

Members will be elected by each campus faculty organization. Members must be tenured and may be senators. Members cannot be persons who are serving on the local Tenure and Promotion Committee or on the Board of Trustees/Faculty Liaison Committee. Committee members shall be elected before the Spring Faculty Senate meeting and will serve for one year beginning at the first Senate meeting of the following academic year.

## PURPOSE

The Grievance Committee is not a court of law; it is a committee elected by the faculty and approved by the University Campuses Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina. Therefore, rules of evidence and other rules of procedure which apply to court proceedings shall not apply to hearings conducted by the Grievance Committee. The purpose of the Grievance Committee is to recommend actions which are fair to all parties. Hearings will therefore be conducted in a manner that is fair to all parties.

## DEFINITION OF FACULTY

Faculty members, for purposes of this grievance procedure, shall include full-time teaching and research faculty, professional librarians, and academic ad-

---

1. All days referred to in this procedure are calendar days; however, when the last day of such a period falls on a weekend or University holiday, the effective date shall be the next regular business day. The day following the actual day of notification shall be the first day in the series. If the respondent fails to comply with a deadline, the case goes to the next higher level. The grievant should be aware that the grievance process is long and that it may be wise to seek legal counsel early to determine whether or not there would be grounds for legal action should the grievance process not provide relief. It may be necessary to begin legal action before the end of the grievance process in order to avoid *going beyond the statute of limitations for some grounds.*

ministrators who hold faculty rank.

#### NON-REPRISAL

Faculty members shall be free from restraint, interference, coercion, or reprisal in bringing a grievance, serving as a representative of a grievant, appearing as a witness, or in seeking information about the grievance policy. The grievant may be represented by an attorney, at the grievant's expense, at any stage in the grievance process.

#### ACTIONS SUBJECT TO APPEAL

A grievance may be based upon, but not limited to, the following:

- denial of tenure
- denial of promotion
- nonreappointment
- dismissal of tenured faculty members
- dismissal of contract employees prior to the conclusion of a contract term
- discrimination in compensation, promotion and work assignment
- any other form of discrimination or unfair treatment.

For grievances involving non-reappointment, see Section I; for those involving denial of tenure or denial of promotion, see Section II. For grievances or procedures other than those stated in Sections I, II, and III, the grievant should attempt to resolve the issue at the unit level. If a satisfactory solution cannot be obtained at that level, the redress may be pursued through the offices of the Dean, or the Chancellor. If redress cannot be obtained from any of these officers, the grievant may appeal to the University Campuses Grievance Committee. Should it be inappropriate to file a grievance at the local level, the grievant may file a request for a hearing directly to the chair of the Grievance Committee. If the committee finds there are grounds for a grievance, the committee shall attempt to resolve the matter through mediation or other appropriate action. The committee shall report its recommendations and the reasons therefor to the grievant and to the Chancellor. The grievant may appeal the action of the Chancellor to the President. The action of the President may be appealed to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees acting in consultation with the Faculty Liaison Committee. A review by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees is the final level of recourse within the University, and actions by this committee are final.

The grievance procedure may be lengthy, and the grievant who initiates a grievance procedure is advised to maintain a file of dated correspondence sent and received as well as dates and notes of conferences held concerning the case. Failure of any administrative official or reviewing authority to comply with the deadlines for action specified herein shall not operate to reverse or modify a

tenure or promotion decision, but shall permit the grievant to proceed directly to petition the next level in the Grievance Procedure.

#### I. GROUNDS FOR GRIEVANCE OF NON-REAPPOINTMENT

Grievances concerning non-reappointment are limited to the grounds of denial of academic freedom or the denial of procedural due process. The matter of due process is deemed to apply in particular to required annual faculty evaluation and the observance of the timely notice requirements. If these grounds are believed to exist, the grievant shall have access to the grievance procedures outlined in Section II.

#### II. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE FOR DENIAL OF TENURE OR PROMOTION

If the grievance concerns denial of tenure or denial of promotion, the grievant upon receiving notice may seek relief by taking the steps outlined below:

1. The first recourse of the grievant shall be to request an immediate oral explanation from his or her administrative officer for the action taken regarding denial of tenure or promotion.
2. If the grievant does not receive an oral explanation or believes the oral explanation is unsatisfactory, the grievant may request from the Dean of the University a written summary of the evaluations and reasons advanced pertaining to the grievant's case upon which judgments were made and action taken. The written request must be submitted to the Dean within seven (7) days of notification of denial of tenure or promotion. The Dean will provide a summary and copies of all relevant documents to the grievant within fifteen (15) days of the request.
3. Within seven (7) days after receiving the summary of the case and reasons advanced upon which judgments were made and actions taken by the Dean, if the grievant believes there are grounds for reconsideration of the case, the grounds for that belief should be stated in writing to the Chancellor. The Chancellor may order a review at any faculty or administrative level on the grounds for reconsideration set forth by the grievant if the Chancellor believes the findings of the review would substantially alter the basis upon which the initial decision of denial of tenure or promotion was reached. The Chancellor shall inform the grievant in writing of the decision and the reasons therefor. At the same time the Chancellor will also inform the grievant of the right of review by the Grievance Committee, including the name of the chair of that Committee and the applicable review procedures. The Chancellor's review, including any unit reviews, must be completed within 20 days.



4. If, after the Chancellor's review, including any ordered reconsiderations and reviews thereof that have been given, a grievant believes there is cause for grievance, the Grievance Committee should be petitioned for consideration of the grievance. Such a petition must be made in writing to the Chair of the Grievance Committee no later than seven (7) days from receipt of the Chancellor's letter. The grievant's letter to the chair of the Grievance Committee must be accompanied by all pertinent data available to the grievant.
  - a. The petition must be based on one or more of the following allegations: inadequate consideration of unit criteria, use of impermissible criteria, denial of procedural due process, or denial of academic freedom. The petition shall set forth the basis for the contentions and the relief requested. The committee shall utilize the following procedures in reviewing the petition:
    - i. The chair shall notify the grievant of the time and place of the review and inform the grievant of the specific procedures governing the review, which shall be closed. The review shall be nonadversarial in nature.
    - ii. The proceeding shall be recorded on tape, which shall be for the confidential use of the committee only.
    - iii. During the review, the grievant shall be permitted to have as advisor either a faculty member, an academic administrator, or private counsel.
    - iv. The committee will assist the grievant in securing the attendance of persons who possess relevant information and may call any persons whose testimony may be of assistance to the committee in making its findings and recommendations. In addition to the summary and documents provided to the grievant by the Dean of the University, the committee will provide the grievant with copies of all relevant documents and evaluations included in the grievant's file. (Documents and attorney work products which would reveal individual votes will be excluded, however summaries will be provided.)
    - v. If witnesses are called, the committee may, at its discretion, allow the grievant or the grievant's representative to question some or all of the witnesses, but such questioning shall be within the boundaries set by the committee

and under the full control of the chair of the committee.

- vi. Within thirty (30) days after the committee receives the grievant's petition, the committee shall conclude the review and prepare a written statement of its findings and recommendations.
  - vii. If it is the judgment of the chair of the Grievance Committee that it would be impossible to maintain a consistent quorum or that it would be impossible for essential witnesses to appear, committee consideration will be postponed to an appropriate date set by the chair. The chair must write to all parties to the case, notifying them of the delay and the reasons therefor.
- b. If the Grievance Committee finds that there has been inadequate consideration of the unit criteria, the use of impermissible criteria, denial of procedural due process, or denial of academic freedom, the committee shall remand the case to the faculty or administrative level at which the inadequacy or denial occurred, and the evaluation of the grievant shall begin anew at that point. The committee shall send a statement of its findings and decisions, including the reasons therefor and a deadline for resolution, to the grievant, to the unit or administrative officer involved, and to the Chancellor. If as a result of the ordered new consideration, the decision is still denial of tenure or promotion, the level to which the case was remanded shall state the reasons in writing to the grievant and to the Grievance Committee.
- c. If the committee finds that the grievant has cause for grievance but concludes that a new consideration of the case would not be worthwhile, it shall recommend to the Chancellor an equitable resolution of the case and provide the grievant and the unit involved with a statement of its findings and recommendations and the reasons therefor. The committee will not, however, substitute its judgment for the qualitative professional judgments of the faculty in determining whether the relevant unit criteria have been adequately met. Thus, disagreement with such faculty judgment is not sufficient basis for the committee to recommend modification of the decision. The committee shall be limited to considering whether or not there is a factual basis in the record, taken as a whole, upon which an individual acting in good faith could rationally reach the result in question.
- d. If the committee recommends that the Chancellor modify or reverse a decision which is unfavorable to the grievant, the Chancellor may act to implement the recommendation. If the Chancellor rejects the recommendation, the reasons therefor shall be

stated in writing to the grievant and to the committee. The Chancellor shall act on the committee's recommendations within 20 days receipt thereof.

5. Within seven (7) days of the receipt of notice of the disposition of the petition, the grievant may appeal the Chancellor's action to the President. The President shall act on the petition within twenty (20) days of receipt of the grievant's appeal. Within seven (7) days of the receipt of notice of the disposition of the petition, the grievant may appeal the President's action to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. The Academic Affairs Committee, in consultation with the Faculty Liaison Committee, shall have thirty (30) days in which to complete its review and communicate its findings to the President, the Chancellor, and the grievant. A review by this committee of the Board of Trustees is the final level of recourse within the University, and actions by this committee are final.

### III. TERMINATION OF TENURED FACULTY

#### CAUSES

Termination or dismissal of a tenured member of the faculty shall be only for cause. Cause shall mean one or more of the following:

1. failure to perform adequately the duties of the position so as to constitute incompetence and/or habitual neglect of duty;
2. misconduct related directly and substantially to the fitness of the grievant's professional capacity as a teacher or researcher;
3. conduct or action not protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States and/or South Carolina and which is a clear interference with the academic functions of the University;
4. prolonged inability for medical reasons to perform the duties required for the position; termination of a tenured member of the faculty for medical reasons will be based upon clear and convincing medical evidence that the grievant cannot continue to fulfill the terms and conditions of appointment;
5. the loss of licensure in any professional area may be considered as a cause for termination if the license is necessary for the performance of one's academic duties;

6. bona fide reduction in staff, which may be caused by financial exigency or by discontinuance or reduction in size of a program or instructional unit for reasons not related to financial exigency.

#### PROCEDURES

1. Discussions with the Chancellor

After it becomes evident to the Chancellor that termination may be desirable, discussions must occur between the grievant and the Chancellor with the intent of arriving at a mutually agreed upon resolution.

2. Re-Assignment

The Chancellor may assign the grievant to new duties if the grievant's continuance of normal duties is not appropriate.

3. University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee

If the Chancellor and the grievant are unable to reach a resolution, the Chancellor shall inform the University Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee of the desire to terminate a tenured member of the faculty. The Chancellor shall give this committee a statement of charges, stated with reasonable particularity, and which sets forth the basis for these charges. The function of the committee shall be to determine whether the facts alleged, if true, would establish the charge and whether the charge is of such a nature as to warrant termination. The discussions, records, and recommendations of the committee shall remain confidential.

The committee shall inform, in writing, the Chancellor and the grievant of its recommendations and its reasons therefor. Should the Chancellor then wish to pursue termination proceedings, the grievant shall be informed by letter of the intention to terminate, including a precise statement of specific charges. The letter shall also inform the grievant of the right to request a hearing on this decision by the Grievance Committee.

If the grievant takes no action within ten (10) days of receipt of notification by the Chancellor, the Chancellor may send a written letter of termination; and the grievant shall not have recourse to further proceedings.

## INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES COMMITTEE REPORT FOR 21SEP90

The Committee last met on May 29, 1990

### INSURANCE PROPOSALS

Proposals were received from Overtoom & Associates and from Corporate Compensation Plans, Inc.. On Accidental Death and Dismemberment and Home, Life, Automobile coverage. The committee agreed not to pursue these proposals.

### CLIFF SCOTT

A memo from Clifford Scott, USC-legal, was received which cautioned the committee about the intermingling of Prudential and Jefferson Pilot plans and funds. The committee moved to resolve the "duality". The committee was also advised, by legal, to research the tax considerations of the Educational Foundation's contribution as the IRS may regard these funds as "employer contributions".

### PRUDENTIAL GROUP LIFE PLAN

Bob Ward and Dot Gamaras, area representatives Prudential's Charlotte Regional Office, met with the committee to address several questions concerning the plan and to evaluate the status of the plan with respect to possible plan improvements.

Mr. Ward expressed the opinion that a plan "open enrollment" providing employees and opportunity to enroll with guaranteed issue would produce adverse selection, (all of the sick employees would apply) and would not be advisable. The committee decided that a general enrollment, subject to medical evidence of insurability, should be held after plan improvements have been made.

Mr. Ward was asked to provide:

1. tables eliminating level term - with no change in coverage amounts
2. tables projecting a 10% across-the-board increase in coverage amounts
3. tables combining 1 and 2 above

Current tables do not provide the amount of insurance for members over age 72. Mr. Ward recommended that the Group Policy be amended to provide that the age 72 amount will apply to all members 72 and over. The committee unanimously agreed.

It was decided that the plan booklet/certificate and the enrollment forms will be reprinted. The Benefits Office will coordinate the booklet's design and content with Prudential. Ms. Gamaras will advise the unit cost of re-printing the

booklets. As an option, if USC chooses to print the materials, the printing costs could be withdrawn from the reserve account.

There was discussion on whether the provision of the group contract, limiting coverage continued under a waiver of premium to age 60 meets ADEA guidelines. Mr. Ward advised that ADEA allows this age-based limit if it can be cost justified. Mr. Ward stated that 60 is the most common age limit for waiver of premium under most life plans, and advised against changing the 60 age limit.

#### JEFFERSON-PILOT DISABILITY INCOME PLAN

John Stinton provided an analysis of Jefferson-Pilot's proposal for improvements to the Disability Income Plan. The committee agreed with Stinton's conclusion that the proposal is not satisfactory, and that we should proceed with solicitation for competitive bids. The committee voted unanimously to pursue the implementation of a group Disability Income Plan.

A request was sent to the President (see attached) for private funds sufficient to cover 50% of the projected premiums for the plan.

#### NEW BENEFIT

Leave Transfer was approved in May, 1989 for USC.

Under this new policy an employee can donate unused sick leave and/or annual leave to a leave pool. Employees may apply to use leave from the pool when experiencing a catastrophic emergency which would result in a severe financial hardship because of lack of paid leave.

You may rest assured that guidelines are in place which will prevent persons who abuse their leave will not be approved to receive leave from this pool.

The MAXIMUM number of sick leave which an employee may carry forward to January 1, is 1350 hours. The MAXIMUM number of annual leave which can be carried to January 1 is 337.50.

The best strategy for placing your excess hours into the pool is as follows;

- A. with the November 15 paycheck determine the number of hours you can safely transfer into the pool.
- B. no later than NOVEMBER 20, fill out and return form P-71 (USC System Leave Transfer Program Leave Donation Request) to the Benefits Office at USC-Columbia. The form must be in the Benefits Office by DECEMBER 1.

The flexibility of the Leave Transfer Program has allowed us

to accommodate numerous USC employees. You can imagine how quickly a regime of chemo-therapy or physical therapy could wipe out an employee's leave hours.

Remember you lose those excess hours on Jan 1; so please, take the forms back to your campus and spread the word.

## UNIVERSITY SYSTEM LEAVE TRANSFER POLICY

### I. POLICY

- A. This document sets forth the University System Leave Transfer Policy for all eligible faculty and staff, except temporary employees, student employees, and certain contract employees pursuant to the South Carolina Leave Transfer Act and regulations of the South Carolina Division of Human Resource Management.
- B. Eligible faculty and staff may donate leave to, or apply for a leave transfer from the University System Leave Transfer Program. The Leave Transfer Program enables eligible faculty and staff who have exhausted all paid leave to request use of leave donated to the program. The request must be based on a personal emergency requiring time away from work which would result in a substantial loss of income because of the unavailability of paid leave.
- C. Leave Donations
  - 1. Faculty or staff earning sick and/or annual leave may donate a specified amount of annual leave and/or sick leave to be transferred from their leave balance to the University System Leave Pool. Faculty or staff with fifteen (15) days or less of sick leave, may not donate sick leave and must maintain a minimum balance of fifteen (15) days after donating sick leave.
  - 2. Leave donations must be made prior to December 1<sup>st</sup> of each calendar year.
  - 3. Once leave has been donated to the Leave Pool, it may not be re-stored or returned to the leave donor.
  - 4. A donor of leave may not designate the recipient.
- D. Leave Transfer
  - 1. Eligible faculty or staff experiencing a personal emergency requiring time away from work for which they have no paid leave may request that a specified amount of annual or sick leave, as appropriate to their situation, be transferred from the University System Leave Pool.
    - a. Only faculty and staff who accrue annual and/or sick leave are eligible to request a leave transfer from the Leave Pool.



- b. For purposes of this policy, a personal emergency is defined as a medical or family emergency or other hardship situation that is likely to require a faculty or staff member's absence from duty for a prolonged period of time and to result in a substantial loss of income because of unavailability of paid leave.
- c. A personal emergency is limited to catastrophic and debilitating medical situations, severely complicated disabilities, and severe accident cases which would require a prolonged period of recuperation. Routine disabilities or disabilities resulting from elective surgery do not qualify for leave transfers from the Leave Pool.
- d. For the purpose of this policy, a prolonged period of time as used in the definition of personal emergency is generally interpreted to be a minimum of thirty (30) working days. A faculty or staff member must have been in leave without pay for a minimum of thirty (30) working days or provide documentation certifying that a medical emergency will result in a period of leave without pay for this period of time. However, an employee who is within thirty (30) days of becoming eligible for long term disability benefits or disability retirement, and who has exhausted all accrued leave due to the prolonged personal emergency, shall be eligible to be considered for leave transfer even though the total period of leave without pay may be for less than thirty working days.
- e. A faculty or staff member must exhaust all earned sick and/or annual leave (as appropriate according to University System Sick and Annual Leave Policies) prior to using approved transferred leave.
- f. Employees who become eligible for other paid benefits will generally be considered ineligible for leave transfer from the Leave Pool. Examples of other paid benefits include but are not limited to workers' compensation, long term disability, and disability retirement benefits.
- g. While there is no limit to the number of separate requests that a faculty or staff member may submit, each separate request must be limited to no more than thirty (30) working days.
- h. When a faculty or staff member returns to work, the personal emergency ends or employment terminates, any transferred leave remaining in the leave recipient's balance must be restored to the Leave Pool. When employment terminates, transferred leave from the Pool may not be included in a lump-sum payment for accrued leave, or included in the leave recipient's total service for retirement computation purposes.

- i. The department head of the individual requesting a leave transfer is responsible for determining whether there are sufficient funds to pay for the leave transferred from the Leave Pool. Insufficient funds may justify denial of a leave transfer request.
  - j. Additional factors such as the individual's leave usage record may be considered before recommending approval of a leave transfer request to the State Budget and Control Board.
2. All requests for leave transfer, regardless of the Departmental recommendation, must be forwarded to the System Personnel Division. On the System Campuses, requests must be sent through the Campus Personnel Officer to the System Personnel Division. Those requests meeting the above stated criteria will be forwarded by the Senior Vice President for Personnel to the State Budget and Control Board for final review and approval.
  3. Decisions of the University to recommend approval or deny approval of leave transfer requests and the decisions of the State Budget and Control Board to approve or deny approval of leave transfer requests are final. There are no administrative or judicial appeals of these decisions.

## II. PROCEDURE

### A. Leave Donations

1. When a faculty or staff member wishes to donate leave to the Leave Pool, a University System Leave Donation Request Form (P-71) must be completed specifying the amount and type of leave to be donated. Donation request forms may be obtained from the Benefits Office of the System Personnel Division on the Columbia Campus or the Personnel Officer on System Campuses.
2. The request to donate leave should be forwarded to the System Personnel Division for review and approval. Faculty and Staff on System Campuses should forward their requests for donation through the Personnel Officer on their campus.
3. When the donation has been approved the leave donor's sick and/or annual leave balance will be decreased by the specified amount. Notification of this action will be provided to the individual donating leave and to their department chairperson. If a donation has been disapproved, the individual and the department will also be notified.

### B. Leave Transfer Requests

1. When a faculty or staff member experiences a personal emergency requiring time away from work for which they have no paid leave, they may request a leave transfer by submitting a University System Request for Leave Transfer Form (P-72) to their department chairperson. The request must include an explanation of the personal

emergency, and a brief leave history explaining why there is insufficient leave to cover the time needed. The personal emergency may be subject to verification.

2. It will be the responsibility of the department chairperson to review the request, verify the leave history and make a recommendation for approval or disapproval. Regardless of the departmental recommendations, the request must be forwarded to the System Personnel Division for review, verification of leave, and disposition. System Campuses should forward the requests for leave transfer through the Personnel Officer on their campus.
3. The System Personnel Division is responsible for forwarding leave transfer requests receiving favorable recommendation to the State Budget and Control Board for final approval or disapproval.
4. If the leave transfer request is approved, the Payroll Office will transfer the approved amount of sick and/or annual leave to the leave recipient's balance.
5. When a leave recipient returns to work, the personal emergency ends or employment terminates, the department chairperson must complete a return from leave notification form (P-73) and send it to the System Personnel Division. System Campuses should route these forms through their Personnel Officer. Any transferred leave remaining in the balance of the leave recipient must be restored to the Leave Pool.

**\*\* OFFICIAL FINAL as of 9/7/90 \*\***

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ENROLLMENT COMPARISON  
FALL 1990

(Includes Correspondence + FII & GRS of previous Falls)	HEADCOUNT		F.T.E.				% CHANGE	
	OFFICIAL	OFFICIAL	OFFICIAL	OFFICIAL	OFFICIAL	HD. CT.	F.T.E.	
	AS OF 9/8/89	AS OF 9/7/90	AS OF 9/8/89	AS OF 9/7/90	AS OF 9/7/90			
Columbia U/G	16,000	16,017	14,645	14,714				
Law	821	819	886	881				
D.Pharm.	36	17	90	95				
*Masters			3,410	3,518				
*Doctoral			1,522	1,533				
*Total Grad.	8,536	8,453						
Sub-Total	25,393	25,306	20,553	20,741				
Aiken	2,633	2,966	1,968	2,193	(F II)	(F II)		
Coastal	4,101	4,080	3,301	3,396	22	22		
Spartanburg	3,422	3,501	2,562	2,681	140	184		
Beaufort	877	896	484	513	63	68		
Lancaster	931	984	619	678	69	58		
Salkehatchie	731	831	450	490	4	3		
Sumter	1,337	1,260	926	939	146	155		
Union	338	368	194	217	-	-		
Sub-Total	14,370	14,886	10,504	11,107	444	490		
TOTAL	39,763	40,192	31,057	31,848	1081	1098		
Med. School: M.D.	251	253	251	253				
: Ph.D.	48	54	65	70				
Total Med. School	299	307	316	323				
*Masters:								
Columbia			2,737	3,115				
GRS			673	403				
*Doctoral:								
Columbia			1,273	1,361				
GRS			249	172				
*Total Grad.:								
Columbia			4,010	4,476				
GRS			922	575				

\*\*\* F.T.E. Divisors Used:

U/G = 15    DPHR = 15  
Law = 14    Mast. = 12  
Doct. = 9

Includes Corresp. and Late GRS FTE:

	1989 (+ 1988)	1990 (+ 1989)
(Cols. :)	Corr. F II/GRS	Corr. F II/GRS
U/G :	211	321
MAST.:	229	221
DOCT.:	65	66
(Audit FTE's excluded:	91	92)

SOURCE: E61 Matrix Program.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research

cd - 9/13/90

(Audit FTE's excluded:

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
University Campuses Faculty Senate Meeting

USC-Columbia

September 21, 1990

Friday, September 21, 1990

Coffee----- 9:30-10:00 a.m.  
Daniel Management Center  
Business Administration Building

Morning Session-----10:00-10:45 a.m.  
Room 801A

Welcome  
Remarks from Interim President Arthur K. Smith  
Deans' Remarks

Standing Committees-----10:45-12:15 p.m.

I. Rights and Responsibilities  
Room 801A

II. Welfare  
Room 855

III. System Affairs  
Room 850 (Back)

Executive Committee-----10:45-12:15 p.m.  
Room 850 (Front)

Deans Meeting-----10:45-12:15 p.m.  
1710 College Street  
Women's Studies Conference Room, 2nd Floor

Luncheon-----12:30- 1:30 p.m.  
Campus Room, Capstone

Afternoon Session----- 1:30- 4:00 p.m.  
Room 801A, Daniel Management Center

Reception----- 4:00- ? p.m.  
HRTA Lounge, Capstone

## AGENDA

- I. Call To Order
- II. Correction/Approval of Minutes: 13 April 1990  
USC-Beaufort  
Beaufort, SC
- III. Reports from University Officers
  - A. Dr. John J. Duffy, Chancellor
  - B. Professor John N. Gardner, Vice Chancellor
- IV. Reports from Standing Committees
  - A. Rights and Responsibilities - Professor John Logue
  - B. Welfare - Professor Mary Barton
  - C. System Affairs - Professor John Catalano
- V. Executive Committee - Professor Carolyn West
- VI. Reports from Special Committees
  - A. University Library Committee -  
Professor John Catalano
  - B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses -  
Professor Robert Castleberry
  - C. University Faculty Welfare Committee -  
Professor Don Curlovic
  - D. Academic Planning Committee - Professor Bruce Nims
  - E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee -  
Professor Kay Oldhouser
  - F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee -  
Professor B. H. Caraway
  - G. Savannah River Site Committee - Professor W. O.  
Lamprecht, Jr.
  - H. System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee -  
Professor Robert Costello
  - I. Other Committees
- VII. Unfinished Business
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Announcements
- X. Adjournment



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S.C. 29208

RECEIVED

AUG 24 1990

Office of the Chancellor  
University Campuses & Continuing Education

LIBRARY PROCESSING CENTER

(803) 777-4206

*File*

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: August 23, 1990

TO: University Campuses Faculty Senate Executive  
Committee  
Standing Committee Chairs  
Dr. John J. Duffy, Chancellor for University  
Campuses and Continuing Education  
Professor John N. Gardner, Vice Chancellor for  
University Campuses and Continuing Education

FROM: *NW* Nancy Washington, Chair

SUBJECT: Executive Committee Meeting  
September 7, 1990  
12:00 Noon  
Faculty House

AGENDA

- I. Approval of Retreat Minutes
- II. Reports from University Officers
- III. Reports from Campuses
- IV. Reports from Committee Chairs
- V. Other items: Presidential Search Committee  
Manual revision  
University Campuses brochure  
System baccalaureate degree  
Resolution about Dr. Varney  
"Information for New Senators"  
Agenda for September 21 Senate meeting

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
University Campuses Faculty Senate Meeting

USC-Columbia

September 21, 1990

Friday, September 21, 1990

Coffee----- 9:30-10:00 a.m.

Daniel Management Center  
Business Administration Building

Morning Session-----10:00-10:45 a.m.

Room 801A

Welcome

Remarks from Interim President Arthur K. Smith

Deans' Remarks

Standing Committees-----10:45-12:15 p.m.

I. Rights and Responsibilities  
Room 801A

II. Welfare  
Room 855

III. System Affairs  
Room 850 (Back)

Executive Committee-----10:45-12:15 p.m.

Room 850 (Front)

Deans Meeting-----10:45-12:15 p.m.

1710 College Street  
Women's Studies Conference Room, 2nd Floor

Luncheon-----12:30- 1:30 p.m.

Campus Room, Capstone

Afternoon Session----- 1:30- 4:00 p.m.

Room 801A, Daniel Management Center

Reception----- 4:00- ? p.m.

HRTA Lounge, Capstone



## AGENDA

- I. Call To Order
- II. Correction/Approval of Minutes: 13 April 1990  
USC-Beaufort  
Beaufort, SC
- III. Reports from University Officers
  - A. Dr. John J. Duffy, Chancellor
  - B. Professor John N. Gardner, Vice Chancellor
- IV. Reports from Standing Committees
  - A. Rights and Responsibilities - Professor John Logue
  - B. Welfare - Professor Mary Barton
  - C. System Affairs - Professor John Catalano
- V. Executive Committee - Professor Carolyn West
- VI. Reports from Special Committees
  - A. University Library Committee -  
Professor John Catalano
  - B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses -  
Professor Robert Castleberry
  - C. University Faculty Welfare Committee -  
Professor Don Curlovic
  - D. Academic Planning Committee - Professor Bruce Nims
  - E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee -  
Professor Kay Oldhouser
  - F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee -  
Professor B. H. Caraway
  - G. Savannah River Site Committee - Professor W. O.  
Lamprecht, Jr.
  - H. System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee -  
Professor Robert Costello
  - I. Other Committees
- VII. Unfinished Business
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Announcements
- X. Adjournment