

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

see y  
not on  
file

TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE  
FEBRUARY 21, 1992  
USC-COLUMBIA

Provost Search Committee

The committee policy is that only the chair, Professor Don Greiner, is authorized to speak on behalf of the committee but I do feel it is professionally appropriate for me to say that I am doing the best I can to represent the interests, values, and concerns of the Regional Campuses faculty and the administration and I will certainly echo those sentiments very strongly when we begin interviewing final candidates. It has been reported in the press that we have approximately 150 applications and it looks to me to be a very decent applicant pool. One of the criteria we are looking for is multi-campus public university system experience and a genuine interest in undergraduate education and teaching. I hope that we will all be pleased with the outcome.

Status of the Faculty Manual Revision

Currently, the Manual is being reviewed in the Legal Office. It has gone through an exhaustive review process in this office and we have forwarded it with great confidence and respect.

Annual Freshman Year Experience Conference

I trust that by now you have all received your invitations to this annual gathering. You are welcome to attend any of the sessions from February 22-25. Your conference registration fees have been waived.

Affirmative Action Officer Search

I am also representing you on this committee for this System position. This is the third committee to attempt to find such an officer for the University. Currently, we have ads placed in appropriate national journals and are developing an applicant pool. President Palms has told the committee he wants to have the kind of individual with whom he will want to interact with on a daily basis. It is my prediction that he will be working much more closely with this position than any of our previous presidents.

Meetings of Academic and Student Affairs Deans

As has been our custom for a number of years, David Hunter and I meet once a semester with the Student Affairs Deans and the same with the Academic Affairs Deans. The Chair of the Faculty Senate is invited and welcome to attend any of these meetings. The Student Affairs Deans meet on February 28, and the Academic Affairs Deans meet on March 20. If any of you would like to present us any agenda items, we would welcome them.

BAIS Program

The College of Applied Professional Sciences has requested that the campuses' academic deans and I meet with APS officials to discuss our current procedures for implementing the standards of the BAIS degree. Of course, we are happy to do so. The College has some concerns about how some of its policies are being administered on our campuses and, of course, we wish to honor them to the letter. There is no real problem here but mainly a need for more regular communication about how we are achieving our important student objectives through this degree. We are optimistic that we will have a positive discussion and I shall report to you about this subsequent to our meeting on this topic on March 20.

*file if not  
on file*

REPORT OF THE VICE PROVOST  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE  
FEBRUARY 21, 1992  
USC-COLUMBIA

In this report I wish to call to your attention several items which I think are of interest.

Sumter Campus

As you know, at the last minute we withdrew the Sumter Four-Year Business Program Proposal from the agenda of the Commission on Higher Education. We did this because we were informed by Dean Kane that the program might jeopardize the accreditation of the College of Business. A committee was set up consisting of Susan Bridwell, John Olsgaard, Susan Foreman, John Gardner, Tom Lisk, and Jim Hilton with Tom Lisk and John Gardner as co-chairs. They put together a document for the College of Business Administration to show how the Sumter program satisfactorily addresses the AACSB accreditation criteria. Dean Anderson met with Dean Kane and the conclusion of the meeting is that we will invite an outside team to look at the program to evaluate the program as an AACSB undergraduate program.

FIPSE

Jim Edwards, Dave Bell, and I have been working with the campuses on this. Four Systemwide faculty meetings in Biology, English, Math, and History will be held this spring. These meetings will be supported by the Provost's Office. I am attaching a chart showing the faculty members from various campuses who have agreed to participate this summer, looking at basic courses in their discipline for content and accountability.

Budgets

As of February 15 the state cut all budgets another 1%. We will begin the next budget year with a base that reflects this cut plus the previous cuts. In addition, any salary raise given University employees would have to be found in the University's base budget.

Spring Enrollments

Enrollments on most campuses were up and in some cases quite a bit. The statistics are appended to this report.

### Division Move

The Division will move to the Carolina Plaza Hotel sometime this summer. At the moment I am certain that we will move our administrative offices, Graduate Regional Studies, Distance Education, and Lifelong Learning. I still have some questions on whether to move the Library Processing Center. Next week, I will review our existing facilities with Charlie Jeffcoat of Facilities Management to determine how much space we will need in the hotel.

### Lancaster Commencement

I am pleased to announce that through the efforts of Ralph Garris, the speaker will be Ambassador Saud Nasir Al-Sabah of Kuwait.

### Bond Bill

The governor signed the bond bill which includes new projects such as the auditorium at Lancaster, the library at Sumter, and the Penn Center at Beaufort.

### Campus Mailings

I have received several comments recently that there has been some trouble on the campuses with systemwide mailings. I have had Mary Kay Hall in my office look into this with the Printing Department. Beginning February 20, the Printing Department will call Mary Kay when a bulk mailing goes out from their office to the campuses for the next four systemwide mailings. Mary Kay will then call the campuses to let them know they are coming and the campus will then let Mary Kay know if they receive the materials. One difficulty on this matter is that some departments provide their own mailing lists and therefore we don't know exactly what type of distribution they use. After this trial period, if there are still problems, this matter will continue to be looked into.

### Additional Attachment

You will find appended to this report a copy of the Fall 1991 AAUP/IPEDS Salary Data for the Regional Campuses.

File

\*\*1ST OFFICIAL as of 1/24/92\*\*

(Includes 0.35% Status 3's)

\*\*FTE Does NOT include

Corresp., JI or GRS\*\*

## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

## ENROLLMENT COMPARISON

FALL 91 vs. SPRING 92

	HEADCOUNT		F.T.E.		% CHANGE	
	OFFICIAL	AS OF	Fall/FI	Sp/SpI	HO. CT.	F.T.E.
	AS OF	AS OF	AS OF	AS OF		
	9/6/91	1/24/92	9/6/91	1/24/92		
Columbia U/G	16,059	14,494	14,441	13,242	-9.7	-8.3
Law	805	766	876	812	-4.8	-7.3
D.Pharm.	72	48	82	48		
*Masters			3,175	2,727		-14.1
*Doctoral			1,361	1,570		15.4
*Total Grad.	8,871	9,389			5.8	
Sub-Total	25,807	24,697	19,935	18,399	-4.3	-7.7
Aiken	3,108	2,920	2,267	2,093	-6.0	-7.7
Coastal	3,983	3,488	3,162	2,849	-12.4	-9.9
Spartanburg	3,525	3,331	2,740	2,574	-5.5	-6.1
Beaufort	1,023	1,050	491	489	2.6	-.4
Lancaster	1,039	963	626	566	-7.3	-9.6
Salkehatchie	935	827	547	504	-11.6	-7.9
Union	1,620	1,468	963	872	-9.4	-9.4
Sub-Total	15,626	14,434	11,014	10,167	-7.6	-7.7
TOTAL	41,433	39,131	30,949	28,566	-5.6	-7.7
Med. School: M.D.	271	264	271	264	-2.6	-2.6
: Ph.D.	55	50	66	64	-9.1	-3.0
Total Med. School	326	314	337	328	-3.7	-2.7

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

U/G = 15

DPhR = 15

Law = 14

Mast. = 12

Doct. = 9

SOURCE: E61 Matrix Program.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research

\*GRS Excluded above (Previous = Sept.):

Masters:	444	610	37.3
Doctoral:	163	231	41.4
TOTAL GRS	608	841	38.4

\*\*1ST OFFICIAL as of 1/24/92\*\*

(Includes 0.35% Status 3's)

\*\*\*FTE Does NOT include

Corresp., II or GRS\*\*\*

## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

## ENROLLMENT COMPARISON

SPRING 1991 vs. SPRING 1992

	HEADCOUNT		F.T.E.**		% CHANGE	
	AS OF 1/26/91	AS OF 1/24/92	Sp/SpI AS OF 1/26/91	Sp/SpI AS OF 1/24/92	HD.CT.	F.T.E.
Columbia U/G	14,428	14,494	12,991	13,242	.5	1.9
Law	784	766	823	812	-2.3	-1.3
D.Pharm.	16	48	50	48		
*Masters			2,583	2,727		5.6
*Doctoral			1,474	1,570		6.5
*Total Grad.	9,281	9,389			1.2	
Sub-Total	24,509	24,697	17,921	18,399	.8	2.7
Aiken	2,753	2,920	2,005	2,093	6.1	4.4
Coastal	3,562	3,488	2,875	2,849	-2.1	-.9
Spartanburg	3,238	3,331	2,485	2,574	2.9	3.6
Beaufort	885	1,050	406	489	18.6	20.4
Lancaster	938	963	556	566	2.7	1.8
Salkehatchie	694	827	443	504	19.2	13.8
Sumter	1,124	1,468	710	872	30.6	22.8
Union	369	387	202	220	4.9	8.9
Sub-Total	13,563	14,434	9,682	10,167	6.4	5.0
TOTAL	38,072	39,131	27,603	28,566	2.8	3.5
Med. School: M.D.	240	264	240	264	10.0	10.0
: Ph.D.	51	50	64	64	-2.0	.0
Total Med. School	291	314	304	328	7.9	7.9
*** F.T.E. Divisors used:						
U/G = 15						
DPHR = 15						
Law = 14						
Mast. = 12						
Doct. = 9						
**Preliminary D.Pharm. Hdct included in U/G.						
*GRS Excluded above (Previous = Jan.):						
Masters:			624	610		-2.2
Doctoral:			244	231		-5.3
TOTAL GRS			868	841		-3.1

SOURCE: E61 Matrix Program.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research

cd - 1/27/92

**PARTICIPANTS IN THE FIPSE CORE CURRICULUM GRANT**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Biology</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>History</b>
USC-Beaufort			Ron Tuttle or Nora Schukei	
USC-Lancaster		Bruce Nims	Jerry Currence	
USC-Salkehatchie		Duncan McDowell ('92) Robert Group ('93)	Jeffrey Strong	Betty Youmans
USC-Sumter	John Logue	Tom Powers	John Varner	
USC-Union	Mary Barton	Tandy Willis		Allan Charles
USC-Columbia	Charles Duggins	William Rivers	Mary Ellen O'Leary	Robert Weir
USC-Aiken		Elizabeth Bell	Nieves McNulty	Elaine Lacy
USC-Coastal	Howard Kramer	Jill Sessoms or Veronica Gerald	Prashant Sansgiry	
USC-Spartanburg				

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FALL 1991 AAUP/IPEDS SALARY DATA - 2-YEAR CAMPUSES

		MALE			FEMALE			TOTAL			% Increase For Incumbents*	
		N	X \$	% TEN	N	X \$	% TEN	N	X \$	% F.B.	N	%
		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
BEAUFORT	9 Mos. Equiv.											
	PROF.	5	40,571	100.0	0	-	-	5	40,571		5	.0
	ASSOC.	7	31,884	71.4	3	34,851	66.7	10	32,774		6	.0
	ASST.	2	26,313	-	3	30,218	-	5	28,656		4	3.1
	INSTR.	0	-	-	2	28,228	-	2	28,228		1	.0
	TOTAL	14	34,191		8	31,458		22	33,197	22.9	16	.7
		-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
LANCASTER	9 Mos. Equiv.											
	PROF.	3	39,949	100.0	2	41,304	100.0	5	40,491		3	.0
	ASSOC.	11	33,381	90.9	4	34,411	50.0	15	33,656		12	1.2
	ASST.	0	-	-	3	29,136	-	3	29,136		6	5.9
	INSTR.	2	25,785	-	1	23,146	-	3	24,905		3	.0
	TOTAL	16	33,663		10	33,081		26	33,439	22.9	24	2.0
		-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
SALKEHATCHIE	9 Mos. Equiv.											
	PROF.	4	39,859	100.0	1	41,694	100.0	5	40,226		5	.0
	ASSOC.	4	31,285	100.0	0	-	-	4	31,285		3	.0
	ASST.	3	27,028	33.3	2	28,164	-	5	27,483		5	2.5
	INSTR.	3	24,231	-	3	23,287	-	6	23,759		5	2.2
	TOTAL	14	31,311		6	27,981		20	30,312	23.4	18	1.1
		-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
SUMTER	9 Mos. Equiv.											
	PROF.	11	41,423	100.0	1	43,565	100.0	12	41,601		8	.0
	ASSOC.	11	33,456	72.7	7	33,862	100.0	18	33,614		22	2.5
	ASST.	6	31,737	16.7	1	27,257	-	7	31,097		6	.0
	INSTR.	2	26,510	-	1	28,010	-	3	27,010		2	.0
	TOTAL	30	35,570		10	33,587		40	35,074	21.2	38	1.4
		-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
UNION	9 Mos. Equiv.											
	PROF.	4	39,875	100.0	0	-	-	4	39,875		3	.0
	ASSOC.	2	31,046	50.0	1	38,000	100.0	3	33,364		4	3.8
	ASST.	1	23,500	100.0	0	-	-	1	23,500		1	.0
	INSTR.	1	23,728	-	1	25,773	-	2	24,751		2	.0
	TOTAL	8	33,603		2	31,887		10	33,259	21.8	10	1.5
		-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Conversion factors: 10.5 Mos. = 0.8571; 11-12 Mos. = 0.8182.

\*"Incumbent" includes only Faculty with same contract base for both years, counted at Fall 90 rank.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research.

- 2/17/92



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FALL 1991 AAUP/IPEDS SALARY DATA - 4-YEAR CAMPUSES

	MALE			FEMALE			TOTAL			% Increase For Incumbents*	
	N	X \$	% TEN	N	X \$	% TEN	N	X \$	% F.B.	N	%
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
COLUMBIA	9 Mos. (+10.5 Converted)										
PROF.	318	57,754	95.9	33	49,859	100.0	351	57,012		323	.2
ASSOC.	242	42,503	91.3	80	39,659	93.8	322	41,796		301	.9
ASST.	132	38,430	11.4	91	34,983	7.7	223	37,023		189	1.3
INSTR.	16	28,548	-	28	22,980	-	44	25,005		32	1.1
TOTAL	708	48,278		232	37,263		940	45,560	21.1	845	.6
	-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	11-12 Mos.										
PROF.	46	69,991	93.5	3	62,356	100.0	49	69,524		43	.8
ASSOC.	21	57,785	90.5	3	58,832	66.7	24	57,916		21	.9
ASST.	6	45,623	33.3	6	40,155	16.7	12	42,889		9	.9
INSTR.	12	36,515	-	14	27,320	-	26	31,564		17	7.6
TOTAL	85	60,530		26	37,960		111	55,243	19.9	90	1.5
	-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
AIKEN	9 Mos. Equiv.										
PROF.	20	45,067	100.0	6	42,508	100.0	26	44,477		20	.5
ASSOC.	21	38,130	85.7	11	37,360	72.7	32	37,865		31	2.9
ASST.	17	30,496	-	19	32,119	31.6	36	31,352		32	2.1
INSTR.	4	26,574	-	10	25,476	-	14	25,790		7	1.2
TOTAL	62	37,529		46	33,283		108	35,721	22.6	90	1.9
	-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
COASTAL	9 Mos. Equiv.										
PROF.	26	43,986	92.3	0	-	-	26	43,986		23	.0
ASSOC.	31	36,953	90.3	13	36,285	76.9	44	36,756		40	.6
ASST.	23	31,203	17.4	23	31,213	43.5	46	31,208		40	1.4
INSTR.	11	22,621	-	14	22,506	-	25	22,557		13	.8
TOTAL	91	35,777		50	30,094		141	33,761	22.8	116	.7
	-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
SPARTANBURG	9 Mos. Equiv.										
PROF.	34	43,614	91.2	12	41,021	100.0	46	42,937		43	.2
ASSOC.	19	36,555	84.2	21	35,137	90.5	40	35,811		36	.9
ASST.	8	30,475	-	11	29,981	9.1	19	30,189		16	3.2
INSTR.	7	29,729	-	17	24,294	-	24	25,879		19	.4
TOTAL	68	38,667		61	32,343		129	35,676	22.5	114	.8
	-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Conversion factors: 10.5 Mos. = 0.8571; 11-12 Mos. = 0.8182.

\*"Incumbent" includes only Faculty with same contract base for both years, counted at Fall 90 rank.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research.

- 2/17/92

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
USC-COLUMBIA  
DANIEL MANAGEMENT CENTER  
FEBRUARY 21, 1992

MORNING SESSION

Chair Rick Boulware (Beaufort) called the meeting to order and welcomed the senators and other guests. He then introduced President Palms who spoke on the subject of the status and content of the System Philosophy statement which has been under development for the last two semesters. After his remarks, he took questions from the floor. (A complete transcript of his remarks and the question and answer session is included as ATTACHMENT 1)

The senators then moved to standing committee meetings.

AFTERNOON SESSION

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Rick Boulware (Beaufort) called the meeting to order, welcomed guests, especially Therese Ziehl from Dr. Duffy's office (a former USC Beaufort student), and thanked Mary Kay Hall of Dr. Duffy's office for making the arrangements for the meeting and luncheon.

II. CORRECTION AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Professor John Logue (Sumter) said that the Chair of the Savannah River Review Committee's last name was spelled "Datta." The minutes of the November 15, 1991 meeting were approved as amended.

III. REPORTS FROM UNIVERSITY OFFICERS

A. Dr. John Duffy, Vice Provost for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education

Dr. Duffy offered to take questions on items in his formal report (see ATTACHMENT 2) and added that he would update the Senate on a few other issues.

Professor Carolyn West (Sumter) remarked that sometimes when information is distributed to the campus Deans that that information "does not make it to the faculty," and asked if a

member of the faculty could also "receive a copy of it" when such materials are distributed.

Dr. Duffy said if each campus would let him know "who the chair of the faculty is," his office would be glad to also send the information to that person.

Professor West added that some faculty members from some campuses received the latest revision of the System Philosophy statement that "was faxed to the Deans yesterday," but that some campuses' faculty members "have not even seen it before they walked into this room and having Dr. Palms asking us to comment on something we haven't had a chance to read is difficult. I realize that was a special occasion outside of your control."

Dr. Duffy mentioned some other items:

1. BUDGET--He said that the Ways and Means Committee had reported out an extra thirty six million dollars to the base for higher education. He thanked Tim Rogers, Harriet Keyserling, Juanita White, Billy Boan, Rich Quinn, Doug McTeer, and Jean Harris. He suggested that if any of these people "live in your area" that they deserved thanks for their efforts. He mentioned the effort to tie catalogue taxes to higher education. He added that the report called for a 2% cost of living raise and a 1% merit raise. For faculty in the past that "has translated out as a 0-6% package." In addition, there will be either a \$110 or \$220 bonus, which will come out of personnel budgets except at USC Union, Beaufort, and Salkehatchie. He added that last year this budget report was the "high point" and that we still had a long way to go. The final budgets will be released in April.

Professor Wade Chittam (Lancaster) asked if Dr. Duffy would comment on the early retirement program.

Dr. Duffy said that if "you have twenty-five years or more, they will give you a window to declare you were going to retire and if you did so you would get a five-year bonus." He added "We don't know the impact of that, but you would give up the slot, basically."

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter): "Has there been any additional dialogue concerning tuition increases?"

Dr. Duffy: "The budget director has come up with a perfectly logical plan: look what it takes to run your campus, figure in your appropriations and other sources of income, and then figure your tuition."

Castleberry: "Because there are different sources of income for different campuses, will different campuses be allowed to charge different rates?"

Dr. Duffy: "That's been suggested, but no decision has been made." He added that two of the smaller campuses do not want tuition increases because of the threats of nearby technical colleges. He added that the "so-called Holderman-Morris agreement has not been funded."

Professor Robert Costello (Sumter) asked that if the Holderman-Morris agreement has not been funded can it be declared "null and void" along with the "list of courses" that would be transferable went along with it.

Dr. Duffy replied that the senate could not declare the agreement null and void but could express its concern over the matter and request the President to invalidate it.

Professor Jerry Dockery (Lifelong Learning) said that if we find someone teaching a course at a technical school whose credentials fail to meet SACS guidelines we could then question the transferability of that course.

Dr. Duffy said that we should focus on outcomes and that if a student had mastered the content or skills the course requires they should be accepted. He went on to say that the Regional Campuses should focus on promoting their own strengths and images and "not worry that much about tech."

B. John Gardner, Associate Vice Provost for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education

Associate Vice Provost Gardner referred the senators to his written report (see ATTACHMENT 3) and, with the Chair's permission, took questions from the floor:

Professor Castleberry (Sumter): "Concerning the Manual revision, in your report you say you have forwarded the document. Does this mean you have forwarded it to the Board of Trustees?"

Associate Vice Provost Gardner: "No. It's in the Legal Office for their final review."

Professor Castleberry: "When do you expect to forward it to the Board of Trustees?"

Professor Gardner: "Well, we'll have to wait and see what the

Legal Office has to say. It's possible it will be ready by the April meeting, but if not certainly by June."

Professor John Logue (Sumter): "Legal is not reviewing the whole document, are they, just a couple of sections that are new?"

Professor Gardner: "They're reviewing all of it."

#### IV. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

##### A. Rights and Responsibilities Professor Gordon Haist (Beaufort), Chair

Professor Danny Faulkner (Lancaster) submitted the following report:

"The Manual should be on its way to the board, and we look forward to its distribution with great expectation.

"Some discussion was given to reform of the Tenure and Promotion process. A motion was passed calling upon

'THE MEMBERS OF THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE (R & R) COMMITTEE THAT HAVE SERVED ON THE SYSTEM TENURE AND PROMOTION (T&P) COMMITTEE TO CONSTITUTE A SUBCOMMITTEE TO DESIGN A NEW T&P FORM AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE R&R COMMITTEE REGARDING T&P. THESE NEW PROCEDURES MUST BE READY TO SUBMIT TO THE COMMITTEE AT THE SPRING MEETING.'

"A professor briefly presented to our committee an idea that division chairs and higher administrators be evaluated by faculty, with the evaluations perhaps being sent directly to the President. We decided to poll our local faculties and report back at the next meeting."

Professor John Catalano (Lancaster): "Who is on the sub-committee?"

Professor Haist (Beaufort): "Carolyn West (Sumter), John Logue (Sumter), Gordon Haist (Beaufort), Jerry Dockery (Lifelong Learning), and Bob Group (Salkehatchie)."

##### B. Faculty Welfare Committee Professor Noni Bohonak (Lancaster), Chair

Professor Bohonak submitted the following report:

"The Welfare Committee met with Dr. Hilenski from the Columbia Welfare Committee to go over the final draft of the 'Policy on Outside Professional Activities.' Although there were

some questions, the draft seemed to meet the approval of the committee with committee members submitting directly to Dr. Hilenski any suggestions or changes in wording.

"The committee discussed the lack of salary information and looked at the AAUP data provided. Because of lack of funds, the committee could not obtain the information directly under FOI but has accepted the kind offer of Dr. Duffy's office to provide the salary information.

"The committee discussed new ethics legislation and will review them later.

"The following resolution was drafted:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT WE DEPLORE THE DETERIORATION OF BENEFITS AND LOSS OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT IN INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ON ALL CAMPUSES. WE COMMEND PRESIDENT PALMS' RECENT LETTER TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM BOAN CONCERNING SALARY INCREASES AND TUITION ASSISTANCE."

C. System Affairs Committee  
Professor Robert Costello (Sumter), Chair

Professor Costello submitted the following report:

"The System Affairs Committee considered Associate Degree curriculum changes on the Lancaster campus in Commercial Science and Nursing, the latter a joint program with York Technical College. (see ATTACHMENT 4 and 5)

"The Commercial Science curriculum was passed by the committee with minimal discussion, as our concerns expressed at the previous meeting had been answered.

THE SYSTEM AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MOVES THAT THE LANCASTER PROPOSAL FOR AN A.S. IN COMMERCIAL SCIENCE BE APPROVED BY THIS SENATE.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

"The A.D. Nursing proposal (see ATTACHMENT 5) received considerable discussion before passing the committee. It includes BIOL 243 in the first semester, which lists a CHEM 102 prerequisite. This requirement is waived by consent of the instructor for the A. D. nurses at Lancaster. The committee's concern was not to insist on enforcement of the prerequisite, in deference to the interests of one of our campuses.

THE SYSTEM AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MOVES ACCEPTANCE OF THE USC  
LANCASTER CURRICULUM IN A.D. NURSING.

An extended discussion followed this motion.

Professor Sal Macias (Sumter) expressed concern over the fact that PSYC 420 or an equivalent was missing from the proposal, since it is listed in the Columbia catalog.

Professor Logue (Sumter) and Professor West (Sumter) raised questions regarding who has the prerogative to waive the prerequisite Chemistry course for BIOL 243.

Professor Wade Chittam (Lancaster) said that the program had been approved by the "National and State Nursing Boards," and that the students in the program have "an almost 100% passing rate."

Professor Rod Sproatt (Beaufort) asked if the senate were being asked to make the waiver of the prerequisite an automatic part of the curriculum instead of remaining on an individual basis.

Professor Roy Darby (Beaufort) asked is this proposal would "dilute the content of Biology 243."

Professor Macias spoke against the motion in light of its "system implications for both Psychology and Biology and I would like to hear better rationale for the proposal because you can be sure we will hear similar proposals from other campuses soon."

Professor Dockery (Lifelong Learning) spoke against the motion on the grounds that "we would be setting a bad precedent if we passed this without talking to the people in the Biology and Psychology departments on the Columbia campus."

Professor Haist asked what was the rational for splitting English 101 and 102 into different time frames.

Professor Catalano (Lancaster) spoke in favor of the motion on the grounds that the issue has been carefully studied and that a contingent of involved people from Lancaster had made the trip to talk to the committee and had convinced the committee of the value of the program.

He also pointed out that this was the second time that the proposal had come before the committee. He emphasized the high completion rate for students in the program and that the program was nationally accredited for the next six years. He could see no reason why the senate should question the program.

A debate ensued over whether the program "compromised" academic standards. Professor Bruce Nims (Lancaster) said it did not while Professor Costello said that without the Chemistry prerequisite, Biol 243 would not have the same content.

Professor Chittam (Lancaster) pointed out that the national and state Nursing Boards do not require any Chemistry for two-year nursing degrees. He added, "They should either cut out Biology or start requiring Chemistry."

Professor Logue (Sumter) said that at his campus they had to offer BIOL 232 to get around not requiring Chemistry and he wanted to know where the permission came from that would allow Lancaster not to have to do that.

Professors Dockery and Macias said that the "quality of the program was not being questioned" but that the "system implications" of the proposal were in question.

Professor Costello said that the academic compromises in the proposal constitute a threat to the Regional Campuses identifying themselves as a separate entity distinct from the technical colleges and that this is a "threat to our whole system. I feel that the future of my campus is on the line when we discuss issues like this."

Professor Catalano said that the nurses "are in the hardest program at USC Lancaster" and that adding the Chemistry prerequisite would expand the program by a year. If that were done, "we would lose people from the program."

Professor Castleberry said he did not agree with the "concept of depleting standards," but was concerned about working within a system concept. He pointed out that "this program was already in existence." He raised the question of "to what extent do we change our academic goals to meet the mandates of some outside agency."

Professor Costello said that "regardless of the outcome of the vote on this matter, we are doing one of the things the President wondered about and that is performing a valuable function for this senate. If we didn't have a forum like this to discuss



these issues, they might go unnoticed."

Professor Bob Group (Salkehatchie): "A question from an uninitiated humanities person: is this a USC Lancaster degree or a York Tech degree or both or either?"

Professor Gardner: "It's both. Students receive degrees from both insitutions. They are registered at both institutions."

Professor Chittam said that it is a co-operative program and that USCL awards the degree to the students registered with them and York Tech does the same with their students, but "they're in the same classes."

Professor Group said that he raised the question in light of asking if the prerequisite issue was relevant in the first place given the nature of the program.

Professor David Bowden (Lifelong Learning) spoke in favor of the motion on the grounds of "a critical need for nurses" and given the fact that the program is already successfully running.

The question was called and THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED BY A VOTE OF 12-10.

The System Affairs Committee report continued:

"Subsequent discussion by the committee was in reponse to the President's request for development of ideas regarding a substantive role for thr Regional Campuses Faculty Senate. This discussion will continue and your input is requested."

Regarding the vote on the USC Lancaster proposal, Professor Gardner pointed out that communications with the Nursing School on the Columbia campus were in good shape, and he asked for guidance from the senate as to "what the next step is" for his office.

Professor Dockery said, "All I want to see is Biology and Chemistry sign off on this."

Professor Logue said the "question may have already been answered. It seems that the work has been done between two nursing schools."

A motion to recall was passed and the original motion was put forth for a re-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE USC LANCASTER'S PROPOSED CURRICULUM CHANGES IN THE JOINT NURSING PROGRAM WAS PASSED 12-11.

Professor Gardner asked that in the future when curricular changes were being proposed that both his office and the affected departments be consulted.

Professor Haist said that we should be cautious when a committee is not comfortable with its own recommendations.

The Chair said he had no problems with the proposal but that it was not presented to the committee until two days before the meeting.

Professor Costello agreed that the proposal was not presented to the committee "in a timely manner" and that that raised a procedural point. He gave a brief history of the presentation of the proposal.

#### V. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Tandy Willis (Union) submitted the following report:

"The committee met on February 7 and at that meeting invited Mike Schoen, the senate's representative to the Academic Planning Committee, to attend to discuss the proposal from that committee to form a new system-wide committee called the System Academic Advisory Committee. After suggesting a few minor alterations in the proposal, the committee went on record as endorsing the formation of that committee.

"Professor Nancy Washington (Lifelong Learning) attended the meeting and reported on the progress of the FIPSE grant oversight committee.

"Professor Costello talked about the progress of the Academic Forgiveness Policy (see ATTACHMENT 6 for the final draft).

"During the meeting today, the committee discussed the Academic Forgiveness Policy again.

"The committee discussed the upcoming activities of the Nominating Committee and looked at the list of members: Jane Upshaw (Beaufort), Bruce Nims (Lancaster), TBA (Lifelong Learning), Wayne Chilcote (Salkehatchie), John Safford (Sumter), and John Wright (Union). Carolyn West is the chair."

## VI. SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

Professor Catalano reported on the December 6, 1991 meeting (see ATTACHMENT 7).

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

Professor Castleberry reported on recent meetings (see ATTACHMENT 8).

- C. University Faculty Welfare Committee  
Professor Susan Pauly (Lancaster)

Professor Pauly's report on the January 20, 1992 meeting was given in her absence by Professor Bruce Nims (see ATTACHMENT 9).

- D. Academic Planning Committee  
Professor Mike Schoen (Lifelong Learning)

Secretary Tandy Willis reported for Professor Schoen (see ATTACHMENT 10).

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

Professor Oldhauser reported on a February 6, 1992 meeting at USC Spartanburg (see ATTACHMENT 11).

Professor Macias: "Will the Regional Campuses GRS program be able to tap into these new programs, or would we even consider such a thing?"

Professor Oldhauser replied that at Coastal the faculty there were already teaching "about 80% of the courses."

Dr. Duffy: "If we can't offer the courses, GRS directors can go to another institution, and have done so."

- F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee  
Professor Mary Barton (Union)

Professor Barton reported that the committee had not met since the last senate meeting.

G. Savannah River Site Committee  
Professor John Logue (Sumter)

Professor Logue reported on the January 14, 1992 meeting (see ATTACHMENT 12).

H. Insurance and Annuities Committee  
Professor Jerry Dockery (Lifelong Learning)

Professor Dockery said the committee has not met since the last senate meeting but would meet soon.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Provost's Search Committee--The Chair reported that the President is opposed to expanding membership of that committee.

2. Regional Campuses Faculty Manual--The Chair went on record to say that the revised Faculty Manual has "been in legal limbo somewhere, and we need the manual."

Professor Dockery: "When you take this albatross from my neck, do you want the rope that goes with it?"

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

1. Professor Rod Sproatt (Beaufort) moved in light of the fact that the Holderman-Morris agreement has not been adequately funded and yet we are being held to it that

THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE REQUEST OF PRESIDENT PALMS THAT HE DECLARE THE SO-CALLED 'HOLDERMAN-MORRIS AGREEMENT' VOID.

The Chair agreed with the rationale for the request, declared the motion non-substantive, and called for discussion.

Professor Gardner asked: "Which parts of it? There are several aspects involved. Are you saying you don't want any of it any more or just the fee portion or what?"

Professor Logue: "I think we'd like to recognize that some of it is already void, and we'd like to void the rest."

Professor Catalano: "Faculties on our campuses were never consulted in the first place about the agreement. If they want to work out some kind of new agreement, fine, but I think we should have some kind of representation in the working out of a new agreement."

The Chair commented that the only result of the agreement that he could see in Beaufort was that the "local tech school changed their name and duplicated the first two years of our course offerings."

Professor Sproatt reminded the senate that his motion only asked the President to void the agreement.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO REQUEST THAT PRESIDENT PALMS DECLARE THE HOLDERMAN-MORRIS AGREEMENT VOID.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Chair announced that the Senate would meet April 10, 1992 at the Swearingen Engineering Center in Columbia and that the Executive Committee would meet March 27, 1992 in Columbia at the Faculty House.

2. Professor West thanked David Hunter for providing data on students that had been requested.

3. Professor West announced a trip for female students on March 5-6 to Oak Ridge to a conference on "Women in Science." She welcomed any other campuses to join her.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

*Tandy R. Willis*

Tandy R. Willis,  
Secretary

## Attachment 1

### President John Palms Comments to the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate February 21, 1992

Good morning. It is wonderful to be at the University in the springtime. I don't think we've had a winter this far and if people want to feel good they just walk around the Horseshoe when it is 70 degrees in February. I hope you have a chance to do that if it gets up to 70 today. I don't have a formal presentation for you this morning. I hope that we can engage on some continuing dialogue about the initiative that we undertook starting right after I came here. I am very pleased that the Core Planning Group has adopted our strategic philosophy document, at least a draft, as of the 18th of February and our intentions are to take that draft and to present it to the Board of Trustees in a final version at the April meeting. We have sent the document back to all of the campuses and to the members on the Commission on Higher Education in the various areas and asked them, again, for final input into this. I have visited the campuses at Coastal, Aiken, and Spartanburg and have met with the various faculty groups there and listened to concerns in the past three or four months. We still have concerns we have to work through. People are now anxious to see what this strategic philosophy framework is going to lead to as far as specific changes in the way we are governed and funded and the way charges are made and all these things that make life interesting when you are trying to run the System. I have been visited by a delegation from Coastal Carolina last week and they're still--this is not a faculty group but members of the foundation there and members of the commission. They still have very, very strong feelings about seeing how the System and they are also beginning to realize what the consequences of secession would mean to them as far as the kinds of services and benefits they derive from being a part of the System. I promised to go back down there and meet with them in smaller groups so they won't have to have a big public session and again relayed to them what we think are the advantages and disadvantages of their staying in and to be very frank and candid, if they insist upon leaving, it does present some serious consequences for the concept of the System. As we review the kinds of services that are centralized and the resources it takes to keep those in place, there is a certain critical mesh you have to have to make those services effective. If we are constantly threatened by campuses who want to leave or are thinking about leaving or want yearly reviews about staying in or not staying in, it is very difficult to get good people to commit themselves to a concept of a system. What I am hopeful that we can do if we finally collectively reach a conclusion that this System is something that is very viable, it's worthwhile, and it is a system that can lead to quality higher education in the state--that we would have a much longer range/concept of commitment to that system. It is already difficult as you know. You see things happening everyday. To deal with this system within a rather

ambivalent concept of higher education in the state--what the responsibilities of institutions are. The legislature can change names of institutions when people are questioning who has the authority to formalize mission statements for the institutions when it is not clear when a president of a university is given authority by the Board of Trustees to purchase a piece of property and it has to go through eight more hoops in order to justify that with every hoop containing new questions de novo and finally ending up with the State Budget and Control Board. That process alone has made me a very educated president as far as how things are decided in this state and it has given me a perspective. There is no question that an enormous redundancy of monitoring appliances, policy formulating authorities, and it is very costly to do that. For every new subgroup in the staff of the Commission on Higher Education, we are obligated to submit and keep data and information and proliferate that for all the institutions in the state. Those are the real costs of having the current system. At least I think we are getting a clearer definition in this state what those costs are. Particularly now that we are being so constrained with our budgets. We are trying to do what is really essential to our mission--that is providing first class instruction and academic services to our students. Every dollar we spend on not worthwhile activities, are constantly before us and it is frustrating and it does make you justifiably mad when you have to spend dollars like that. The Ad Hoc Committee of the Board is also working and you may not have heard that the chair of that committee has appointed some subcommittees to look at various aspects of the System, its governance, its finances, its academic programming. They are mandated to come back to the Ad Hoc Committee in the spring and there are people on those committees who have concerns on how that parallels the process we have already initiated here and we are trying to work through that. At one of the Ad Hoc Committee meetings we had an audit report about the charge system we are now using in the System and it was a good presentation of the history of how that charge system came about and various auditing activities that have taken place over the past several years. We have been asked by that committee that by March 1 (I don't believe we can meet that deadline) to review the audit report and to make recommendations on how we could improve the funding of those centralized activities for the System. I think, ideally, that charge back systems don't work very well. I have expressed this before, I have never seen one that did. I have been involved in one over the years. Ideally, you would like to have centralized funding coming directly to a centralized office and services provided. That would take a commitment on the part of the CHE and other people at a time when budgets are not very generous it would be difficult to do, but I think we need to make such a statement--such a recommendation as a result of this review and we will see how this review of those charges is addressed. I have asked the Core Planning Group to do that and they are also the ones who have been on a day-to-day basis involved with the issues that have come forth from the symposia and get-togethers we have had on the campuses. I have had reports and I am very pleased with the identification of some of those concerns and issues and the

progress that is being made on addressing those. We haven't just been sitting around waiting for the strategic philosophy statement to be completed. We have addressed some immediate concerns that I believe I hear that there is a good cooperative spirit and that there is progress being made on those and I think that was the intention when we first started to address this issue. I would rather spend the rest of the time answering any question you have about that particular initiative. I think it is very important and in a way it is a good time to do this. Because of the budgetary realities of the System it makes you think harder about the associated costs and the cost benefits involved with the concept of the System. I know it is time consuming but I think it will be beneficial to us to complete this by the spring. I am hopeful that some representation from the Ad Hoc Committee could meet with this group sometime when you meet. I have no doubt that the dialogue with at least the leadership of that group to understand the approach that they are taking towards this. We are keeping the Board of Trustees informed, of course, about the group's progress. We get mixed reactions, mixed concerns, mixed involvement in that process. I think it is our challenge to sensitize the trustees and make them aware of the needs that they should be addressing as they have the responsibility of being trustees of the University of South Carolina System and not just the Columbia campus. So with that short introduction, I would like to answer any questions that you may have. I appreciate that many of you are communicating with the Columbia campus, some of you with me personally either by telephone calls or scribbled notes every now and then. Those suggestions have been very, very helpful. Many of them have been incorporated into this document. I think you can read it in the language. I think the language is very, very important and I think this document, as many times as it has been edited, I am please with the language. I think it is an inviting document. I think it speaks to our aspirations on having quality higher education. I think it allows in a reasonable way for the autonomy that you need to run your institutions. I think it is hopeful that as our economic times come back in a more positive way, that they will allow for development. We are not always going to be living in a recession. We are talking about a long-term philosophy on the future of higher education in this state. I think the document is well-written as far as that aspect of our collective involvements and concerns. I would be glad to answer questions and have discussions about any subject matter on this regard...

Jerry Dockery -- Did this Core Planning Group also look at the SACS study?

Palms -- I assume that they have. As you know, all of the campuses have been reaccredited--the Four-Year Campuses as well as our System Self-Study. They have all had access to that. I can't speak for the individuals how much they have read it the Self-Study, but it has been available to them...

Dockery -- Well, one of the things that SACS talked about was the evaluation of administrators. I know that for a time we had some



activity in trying to develop instruments for evaluation but I didn't know what had happened to that--what had happened on the Columbia campus or any of the other campuses.

Palms -- I will let George (Reeves) address the Columbia campus.

Reeves -- We have a kind of a joint instrument developed by faculty and the deans with the faculty having more say than the deans. That is that the deans did one and then the faculty got hold of it and modified it. We are doing a few final modifications but we will be ready to go with that in middle of March. We are going to go ahead and evaluate all of the deans on the Columbia campus in this first round and then set up a systematic, periodic evaluation. That is for deans only. We don't have an instrument exactly for evaluating VPs or others at this point but we can adapt, we can do something about that as the second phase of this.

Duffy -- Four of our campuses have formal approaches to evaluation of not only the dean but other administrators as well, the fifth campus, Beaufort, Chris, you have plans to put it in place.

Plyler -- It is being looked at and once .....

Duffy -- There has been faculty input on all of these instruments.

Dockery -- So we are still developing instruments at this point. No one has actually done an evaluation....

Duffy -- No, I have got the evaluation sheets. I have had them for years on four of the five deans.

Dockery -- Where are those for people to look at them?

Duffy -- In my office. I got an open door policy, Jerry as you well...

Dockery -- Yeah I know, I was just going to put out a report card and make sure it got disseminated.

Duffy -- Well you could evaluate your Dean...

Dockery -- I evaluate my Dean everyday .... and vise versa, its a two way street. Sometimes the flow is too much to swim against..

Castleberry from Sumter -- this document is a very broad-based statement of developing philosophy. I think the effectiveness of it really does depend upon the collegiality of the process, which is addressed and one of the focal questions seems to be the autonomy to run the individual institutions. One of the problems that I see on the Regional Campuses is that we use the Columbia Bulletin course descriptions. In the past we have our faculty approved by the Columbia campus, and when we work with one of the sister campuses approved by that institution for the approval to teach certain courses. We do that for both full-time and part-

timers. If we take it as the autonomy for us to run our own program is to meet the needs of the community and at a minimum to offer the lower division type courses. If an approval unit in Columbia does not share the philosophy of collegial environment and in fact doesn't want to see their courses offered on the Regional Campuses even though they'll accept transfer courses in from the technical institutions--how can that kind of a problem legitimately be addressed? And there are some examples of that.

Palms -- Well, this is a problem you can identify. One of the ways is to collectively in their disciplines meet together. Those kinds of meetings have been taking place. George, do you want to comment?

Reeves -- Yes,. We haven't commenced with the FIPSE Grant yet -- meetings for FIPSE to discuss this kind of collaboration. But, I would say in regard to what you were just saying, the faculty on this, (lets say we are talking about the department of Physics) the Physics Department, well that is maybe not a good example--to specialized. Lets say Biology. The department would not allow anyone to teach any course they wanted to in that department. That happens on this campus all the time. They would approve--does this person have the right expertise to teach these undergraduate courses? Okay. If not, then get somebody else. You couldn't expect the department here to say, well, anybody on a branch campus can teach anything we got in our catalog in biology. They simply would never agree with that. Is that totally out of the ballpark?

Castleberry -- No, I would suggest that is totally out of the ballpark primarily because it assumes that a Regional Campus would be audacious enough to suggest someone to teach a course that that campus does not believe that person is qualified to teach. I am talking about a campus suggesting a faculty member be cleared to teach a variety of courses. They may have a masters; they may have a Ph.D. in an area and that this administrative unit, this local unit says, "we believe this person is qualified to teach" and that really not going anywhere. Specifically, there are, I think, a number of meetings that go on that are systemwide. Psychology is very good about doing this. English used to be. History used to be. I don't know what has going on in those areas lately. Chemistry has certainly done some stuff. I know Biology has done some stuffy. So there is a lot of collegial dialogue in some areas. But in other areas, frankly there isn't.

Reeves -- Well, the FIPSE grant I think will move this along with the idea that campuses will be meeting with other disciplines. I know this have been very effective. I know that ....

Carolina West -- The FIPSE grant does not address the areas where there are problems and it is difficult to see how when you are talking about areas such as Biology, English, History, and whatever the fourth is, how that will address the problems that are really in other disciplines. It may start a dialogue in those particular areas but to demonstrate that that is going to spill over, I don't

think that there is evidence of that.

Reeves -- Well, I'd like to meet with those of you who feel that there are problems from the five campuses, and know what these areas are. If you could set that John and John. If we can get together and have a meeting to find out what these areas are then we can begin to work on it. Because we are in something of a new era now where you are accredited along with Columbia and we've got solve these problems. You should be able to sponsor them. In whatever areas you are qualified to teach. So, I really think that we need to work on that. I don't know what all those areas are...

West -- It is an important priority because I think that in some instances, some people on the Columbia campus are operating from a historical point of view when our campuses were very different than they are now. And many people on this campus do not recognize that we have become strong, emerging campuses and they are still treating us as if we were "branches."

Reeves -- We are going to have to do some attitude adjusting and I think that if we can set up a meeting we can get a start on that.

West -- It is an important priority. Thank you.

Palms -- My experience in the brief time I have been here is that when groups like this come together in their disciplines, that they will be able to resolve...

Dockery -- Yeah, but the other part of Castleberry's questions is you've got some of the same people that we want to approve to teach a course but they are teaching at another institution in the same department that won't let this person teach for the University but will turn around and accept that course. My wife took a course at another institution in town here from a staff person at the University of South Carolina that we won't approve to teach an undergraduate course and he taught a graduate course in the same area. And these people are "accredited." And there is no national hotline to call up and say "you've got a loony-tune teaching a graduate course who shouldn't be and the institution has allowed this person to teach." SACS accreditation--what is it? They come in here and beat us half to death over little things and then you've got people that we say are not qualified to teach undergraduate and these same "accredited institutions" are using this person to teach graduate courses? Something's got to give somewhere at the national level--not just within the University System.

Palms -- this is why the United States Congress may be getting into this. God forbid. These kinds of anecdotal stories that people tell which are really not indicative of what is really going on. The whole....the Secretary of Education is a moral examiner disaccrediting one of the accreditation associations in the country based on some of these kinds of stories. We have to be very, very careful.

Dockery -- Well, it may not be indicative but in a small community, for instance where you have a criminal justice program that we won't allow someone to teach because they clearly don't have the 18 hours in that area and they are letting him go to the TEC school to teach that same course and WHAM! that course transfers right into the program.

Palms -- I've seen long lists of courses that the Four-Year Campuses will accept from the technical schools but that is conditional upon the fact you have somebody qualified to teach it. You could make that a condition of acceptance.

Dockery -- Okay, so after the TEC school has screwed every....

Palms -- .... With the authority that the TEC schools now have, the agreement which you are signing with the TEC schools, I have seen those lists of courses, that is where that ought to be settled--at that level of negotiation. To just blankly sign off on a list of courses without some stipulations to what the qualifications of the people teaching, then you are going to be in real trouble. Yes. And you're going to be priced out of the market.

Castleberry -- I just want to say my hopes were not aimed so high as the entire United States but merely within this System....and that you are talking about qualified people, that have been acknowledged as such by the units. I understand the trickiness of autonomy of different units that are now, maybe with this document, having to work a little more closely and I do see that there will be some changes made. But, I think it is critical that those problem areas can be sort of prickly perhaps.

Palms -- Well, as George said, we accredited now by the Southern Association as a system. We have criteria for what it takes for people to teach discipline courses. If we can agree that these are the criteria we've got to adhere to those criteria. So you should have the autonomy as long as you live within that policy. I know the emergency situations where you may have deviate from that but on the whole I think that is what we are working toward. If you've got grandfather clausung to do with some individual I understand that, too. But, I think that is a good step forward.

Castleberry -- I guess its ..... because of the system accreditation and our opportunity to teach courses in some cases that are new on our campus but in other cases, teaching 300 and 400-level courses as we have done for years and still the Commission on Higher Education refers to us as two-year campuses in everything that they do and I am wondering if in the past it has been tough ..... trying to get some acceptance to where they could at least acknowledge in the Commission on our role as campuses regardless of the name we've used. We've tried University Campuses, Regional Campuses, and you have already had some experience with the Commission with your education of what goes on in this state and is there without tipping your hand or saying anything .... is there some way for us as a system to overcome

this? Is there something that we can do that we haven't been doing to gain this acceptance with ....?

Palms -- Well, this is part of our challenge to get the system formally acknowledged. It has never been formally acknowledged as a system. Collective of the contractual arrangements with local communities. The system concept formally acknowledged would address exactly those issues. And that is the cause of this. Right now they treat our campuses no differently than they treat any other four-year campus among all the four-year campuses in the state with a two-year philosophy. Because I don't think we've been clear enough on what exactly we mean by this system. This document is the first step to that. If that is not acknowledge, we've got a real problem. When Jack and I talked to the CHE we made a pretty clear case and I .... the campuses teach graduate-level courses, junior- and senior-level courses, and that is one reason why I would love them to give the deans in this new organization of college presidents a vote along with the technical schools. We are not like them. We are in discussion with them about things like accepting credit but we don't want to be categorized as the same kind of institution .....

? -- the regional campuses. In connection with that ....

Palms -- I don't know if I would say .....

? -- ... is that an outmoded term or ....

Palms -- If you are talking about the Greenville Center for Higher Education. That is certainly not what these campuses are. Some people in Hilton Head would like to see them encompass all the .... president. This is a Regional Campuses .... with a very clear identity with the University of South Carolina.

? -- Well, a question that was asked by one of my faculty members was with the Columbia faculty's recent increase in admission standards, for example, does that imply anything to us as a faculty senate or to our campuses in that area? In other words, in connection with the previous questions, now that we are accredited through Columbia, now that we are part of the system as you say, these smaller things might be things that the FIPSE dialogue and so forth doesn't address and doesn't .... you know it just leaves some question marks .... How do you see our place in that?

Palms -- Well, you certainly have a lot of autonomy in setting your own admission standards right now. You are supposed to admit people who have satisfied you know the core...the colleges high school requirements but in fact there is a lot of flexibility on your campuses and our faculty here have taken their prerogative and they have set their standards. There are implications for that on the other campuses. I think we have to address those. Our faculty here are going to have an incremental rise in admissions standards. I think that is important. That can help you in some ways and it could have a negative affect on you also. Our colleges here are

also raising admissions for the junior year and that is affecting those students who come in with less than those credentials that we are moving towards.

? -- but you wouldn't see it as unnatural or as a problem if five different Regional Campuses had five different set of admissions standards?

Palms -- You already do. I wouldn't want to overformalize those admissions criteria. We have to have the flexibility when you are dealing with such different cultures, preparations, .....

Gardner -- My comment really, I wanted to followup on the points that were raised by Senator Castleberry and Senator West. As the Vice Provost said a few minutes ago, we've had an open door policy for years, some would say perhaps to a fault, and we need to hear directly from any of you if you have concerns about credentials of faculty or approvals for courses to be offered if there are certain examples and issues you want us to look at...I think that John and I have a pretty good idea precisely what your concerns are but we need to hear very specifically. When we have co-sponsored these discipline-based meetings for years and we work on this daily but we need to hear from you about your specific concerns and so we solicit them.

West -- I think we have always felt that you are with us and that I think that what we would like to see developed is rather than our going to the table for a dialogue, what has usually happened has been a "no" from the other side and how can we address no's and is there anyway that we can work through that as a system rather than us having campuses that really don't have autonomy because we are asking permission as if these were our parents or something rather than our colleagues. And I have to say I am not talking about Biology because Biology has been extremely accommodating and collegial.

Palms -- Are you talking mainly about the 300- and 400-level courses or special courses you are having faculty teaching?

West -- 100- and 200-level courses.

Castleberry -- Courses which are very...we have qualified people who can teach the courses but it is like getting teeth pulled without anaesthesia to get that individual approved even though...

Palms -- What is the problem? Is there a disagreement on the qualifications?

Castleberry -- I think there are just different philosophies that are involved. It is in all honesty something that the Vice Provost's Office is working on and continuing to work on. I think you aware of what the problems are. And some progress has been made in other areas. I neglected to say that there was a regional meeting of the Religion Department fairly recently which was quite

helpful that I attended. But again this... the fundamental question is that if our mission is to cover 100- and 200-level courses at a minimum, as we see a service need out there, I am beginning to wonder why do we need to have permission, not collegial dialogue but permission, to use someone who has a master's degree actually from the Columbia department itself to teach that course? Its problematic.

Palms -- Well, ..... policies the Southern Association Criteria. If you meet those criteria, it is your judgement whether you want those people teaching those courses. Now I suggest that if there is no violation of those criteria, I don't see why you need ....

Castleberry -- I mean I would concur but I think that that is a slightly different interpretation than has historically....

Palms -- We have come a long way.

Duffy -- Let me clarify something. Except in a few cases, we don't seek approval for 100- and 200-level. We only seek upper-division from all the Humanities areas, all the science area, and all of BA. I think we are referring to a very specific thing that I'd like to talk to you about but it is also something I think we've solved.

West -- Dr. Palms, do you see evidence of healing in the relationship of the University and the rest of the state in terms of us paying for what may have been past sins of the University? In particular, I make the observation as a citizen the uproar that was created by perhaps The State newspaper, perhaps politicians, about the purchase of property in downtown Columbia and yet I also see in editions of the same newspaper the fact that the College of Charleston or Clemson University is building facilities that cost far more than acquiring facilities that include things like golf courses and yet I do not see the same criticism or the same denigrating tone that I sensed from the newspaper about the University. Could you share with us if you think we have made progress in the year that you've been here and a healing process, or is that yet to begin?

Palms -- Well, you can sense for yourself. I think particularly since Christmas there has been an enormous relief and I think that in a real sense that we're back on track and that bygones are bygones. We are big news in the state. When The Gamecock publishes something, it is going to be in The State newspaper. And when somebody said you could use this money with which you are buying a piece of property you could raise faculty salaries. The fact that somebody said it is entertaining and it is going to sell newspapers, it is going to be in the newspaper. But I've visited with publishers, editors, writers of all the newspapers and I am satisfied with that the philosophy they now have, the trust they now have for the University. That doesn't mean that we are not going to get that kind of reporting. It will come and go and I don't think it is going to nearly be in the depth it was here a year ago. And I think we are fair game. We're an important place.

If we want to buy a hotel, we need to explain to people why. And we have learned a lot from that process. The kind of preparation that will take place and the kind of education that will take place. We were under constraint by a deadline for closing from RTC. So we had to expedite it and that created a lot of problems. So I think we learned a lot from that process. I think it turned out alright. I think we are doing much better, and I can tell you that as I stood before the Budget and Control Board, I felt like ..... so many times. You know this process helped us express our philosophy of the system. I got a chance to meet with the Governor. I met with Grady Patterson. I met with Earle Morris. I met with ..... over and over again on how this fits in with the philosophy of the system. What the problem of the system and the legislature. How can we deal with the CHE and its staff. Does the staff reflect the philosophy of higher education and it is not the philosophy of the CHE. So all that dialogue has helped a great deal and I have a lot of notes coming across my desk expressing appreciation for that kind of .... discussion. I think we've got a credible operation now. It is really up to us to see that we don't abuse it and that we move forward and provide the citizens of the state the part education ..... I am encouraged, in spite of the budget problems that we are having. I think we have work to do to educate people that we are not just two-year campuses. The Sumter exercise was another good lesson on what people's perception was. How they interpret things. And the involvement of the staff in interpreting something ..... and we have to work on it. I think we've almost got that solved .... that particular case solved. And I mean there are respected opinions about how much we can do in this state with higher education with the resources we have and the limits of growth and whether every institution can be four-year, or a university, or a comprehensive community college (whatever that is) whether that concept serves the economic needs of this state better. We haven't had open enough discussion about that. There has got to be some mechanism for doing that. I feel good about the progress we've made. I think that it is reflected in the giving to the university. Certainly in the good spirit of the business community involved in the higher education summit. When we came together again in Kiawah and continued that discussion. We are getting support from the major corporations in the state ..... expense of higher education should be in the future ... we are talking about the major CEOs, people who are really important ..... decision-making in the state and I feel good about ..... I would like your own local perceptions--what do you hear in your communities? Commissions, citizens, or am I misinterpreting it? ..... in the middle of things....

Costello -- I wonder if you could share with us your current perception of this Senate which apparently wasn't formulated last spring when you visited with us.

Palms -- I am not clear .... I don't know how we can effectively create a function for this senate that will be meaningful. I hate to waste people's time. Looking here right now and thinking of the costing the University. What can you really do. Communication is



important but hopefully more than communication. If we have issues that involve governance, faculty and curriculum, if you're dealing with the system, this senate could be very practical. I am please with the way the senate works on the Columbia campus. I am involved with that process. The fact that we raised admissions standards here wasn't just the faculty moving completely independently. I had the chance on three occasions to meet for long periods of time with the Admissions Committee talking about the issues of raising standards on this campus and there was an exchange of dialogue. What happens if our enrollment drops 300 or 400 if we raise standards? Are you going to penalize us? What does it do to the budgets? What does it do to our diversity, our perceptions? How about course ..... I don't see how this body has interacted like that, yet. It is a new body and we have not had a document like we've had ... at least a strategic philosophy of this system. We have not taken the next step in this document--how do we set up a governance system with faculty input in the system concept manner that will address the issues we are bringing up here? So I need your help on that. Is this what you are ..... How would you organize it without being overly cumbersome and burdensome on your time? There are some other generic issues that are really very important. Can you identify those, so the senate can slowly start to work on to make a difference? I'm hearing some of these and I just haven't seen an organizational structure that can address those effectively. But if you ask me should we .... right now, for goodness sake lets keep coming together. I think it is worthwhile. I have been to every campus three or four or five times since I've been here. You just can't keep that up for just goodwill and just talking without programmatically addressing issues that are .... some structural way. When I come I'd like to have the opportunity to work with you in addressing some of these issues and accomplishments. How do you all feel about it? ..... There are more than three or four people here so I am trying to recognize the people who maybe haven't said anything yet. I have one issue that really is an important issue. You talk about a list of accepted courses that we agreed to transfer of credit between technical colleges and the Regional Campuses. That relationship is an important one. A three or four page list of courses that would be transferrable to your campuses--so there must be some dialogue there. I've gotten calls from Fred about them. And some of the campuses to share in some of the physical facilities for some courses that are needed in that region and ..... of technical nature. How rigorous they run, what the substance of those courses are, is there some way of providing quality technical higher education in collaboration because technical education has become more sophisticated? ..... four-colleges, engineering technology colleges. They are more than just the tech schools the way we used to have them but they are schools that are offering a level of technology at a higher level along with liberal arts education. They are not engineering schools where you have or electrical or chemical, but they are important entities in our nation right now. We just have that distance and we know things are already happening in those other schools so I think that is an issues we need to continue to talk about. I don't think that the Council of

Presidents organization as it is restructured is the most effective way that those issues are going to be addressed. Part of it will be but in that kind of collective body... It is better worked out between you and the institutions that are in your areas. Because I tell you one thing for sure, with the demographics and the economy the way it is the spread of the middle class disappearing, enrollment at the two-year institutions and the technical institutions is going to continue to rise. To a lot of people that's a real bargain. They are self-driven. They just want those credits. They are not interested in the whole philosophy of what makes a scholarly community campus. They are working. They want to take a course, get credentials and move on. And that, to your benefit, is going lead to increased enrollments in higher education in this country. More people go back and we just need to address it in a more holistic way than we've been doing. It is very difficult, very challenging when you are dealing with different cultures coming together...

Haist -- I am beginning to see a concern develop during the first two years of undergraduate study because I have very clear .... of the difference between the technical and the academic ..... and in the latest version of the strategic philosophy it is still the case that the Regional Campuses primarily are identified as two-year campuses ..... There is in other words a sense of a tiered structure. A few years ago we had an effort to define the baccalaureate degree as a central degree of the University. It appears now that at least in terms of the Regional Campuses, we are going to continue with the associate degree and I am beginning to wonder whether we should rethink the nature of the associate degree and what it offers possibly in relationship to the four-year degree that is also in the system. Historically, it functions as a mechanism for a student to acquire a general training after which he will specialize in a certain area and if we are indeed going to have to offer degrees that are responsive to our community, it seems to me it is linkage to the university on these first ..... This is where we bring out the greatest test. It may be that as ..... we will have to have Humanities components ... more of these types of activities that are associated with technical activity or business activities .... I see attention there and I'm afraid it is not totally clear. I guess the question I would like to put to you is whether we should begin to look at the associate degree and try to give it some content, some sense of direction that is greater than the handmaiden to the bachelors degree? Is it right to redefine its content in such a way that there is a very positive direction we are pursuing .... within the framework of the liberal arts, separate or apart from what is going on at the four-year degree level?

Palms -- That is a profound question. My own .... certainly is reluctant to try to overhaul that philosophy of the first two years. I am still hearing from major corporations, "give me trainable people who can think and write and have analytical skills, do things in a quantitative way." We will train them but we are not doing this in high school ..... and we are still not

doing this well in college. We are not really committed ..... to the real philosophy of a liberal arts education. We are just not rigorous enough or demanding enough. We still cater to the wishes of ..... We just don't have a tough enough system to provide the economy and the industry with the kind of talents they really need. That is not just very narrow skilling but that kind of education that gives you those skills also gives you a better intellect to deal with change which is happening in all of our corporations. I still believe that a liberal arts education is the best preparation for that in the true sense of a liberal arts education .... I was interviewing the most outstanding candidates for the Law School Admissions last night .... and just asking people what they were majoring in and their best students from South Carolina, .... Virginia, Chapel Hill, Duke, Emory, they've all applied and are going for scholarships. What did you major in? What did you take? Did you take any science or courses about science? Any quantitative skills? No ... no quantitative skills. Yet the law profession is now dealing with very technical matters now whether it is nuclear power plants or it is electronic sales or whatever. There is no scientific or mathematical vocabulary in their education. We are not doing a service to our society. Apparently .... besides ..... that first two years ..... You can take courses about sciences, take courses about quantitative methods, but you are not going to teach them .... The corporations are doing it themselves. They are getting the college graduates and they are running them through the kind of quantitative skills they need. In some cases they are sending them back to the TEC schools to learn those skills.... We just can close our eyes and act like that is not an important criticism of our function.

Jean Gray -- Do you foresee in the near or distant future the reinstitution of the undergraduate degree in education?

Palms -- No. I don't. That is a whole different subject. We are suffering from the same lack of liberal arts education core in elementary school teachers that we are in industry. You have an elementary school teacher who doesn't like math or science .... skills they are not going to ever talk about them in the classroom. You are going to cut off those people early on in life with those options because you just are not going to introduce them. I'd still like to educate a teacher first and then teach them a specialty. I haven't seen anything to convince me ....

Pete Arnold -- I'm not quite sure how this is going to come out ..... with what he said. A couple things...first...this gets back to the point that Carolyn made earlier that the perception of our Regional Campuses on the part of a lot of our colleagues in Columbia is considerably behind the times...that is many of us there are perhaps even now after three decades of our existence of service and contribution some people who still haven't quite caught up with that and if to be perfectly fair, and I say this knowing full well that I could be drummed out of....that the TEC campuses, by the same token, haven't stood still either. I think in all fairness we ought to recognize that they have changed, too, to meet

change in demands in a society of technology and that sort of stuff. And I am increasingly concerned about the fact, and this is just a personal tangent that is not widely shared, that we spend entirely too much time worrying about what TEC people are doing. We spend entirely too little time worrying about what we should be offering and it is important ..... what you said for example. It seems to me that we need to continue to work very hard to strengthen what we are offering in our associate degree programs and to establish credibility so that when the students either transfer from our campuses to Columbia ..... we send confusing messages to our constituents and we .... in regard to what is going on now, particularly with respect to the budget and the state of the economy, I'm gravely concerned about the fact that at our campus, and I have made no secret about it--we've talked about .....--I think we've kind of stood still for the last several years. We are not maintaining the kind of momentum that I thought we were in those days. We have not hired a full-time, tenured faculty member in two years. We have not bought any educational equipment outside of what we get with our grants for about the same period of time. I am embarrassed to say this we have very little supplies; we've had to cut travel. What I am saying is when we talk to not just a legislators, we just in a meeting about that earlier today, but just ordinary equal in our conversations, I don't care if it is in the beauty parlor, barber shops, our civic and church groups. When they ask us how things are going we ought to tell them how things are going. That is, we have, I think, very good quality programs at our campuses. I mean all of us. Teaching effectively, a lot of us take a little pride in that, but we need to let people, and I am talking about ordinary citizens of South Carolina as well as legislators because they talk as well, we ought to let them know that we all face some very, very serious problems and I don't care how much we talk about a lot of other things, we need to get back to the basics. We do not have the amount of resources now coming to our campuses, do all of us agree with that, that we need. We really don't. People ought to be concerned about that. We are not the only people that ought to take that seriously. The people ..... particularly who depend on us to provide quality graduates to come out of our two-year programs. The people who transfer ought to know our concerns and that seems to me the essential message we ought to be communicating. We ought to be concerned. They ought to know and share our concerns. A copy of this address will be available.....

Palms -- Well you know as well that the public at large does not feel dedication for us. It was always K-12. It still is K-12. No matter what we say what with all the priorities listed for this legislative year, it is not higher education although I think that they realize

ATTACHMENT 2A

REPORT OF THE VICE PROVOST  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE  
FEBRUARY 21, 1992  
USC-COLUMBIA

In this report I wish to call to your attention several items which I think are of interest.

Sumter Campus

As you know, at the last minute we withdrew the Sumter Four-Year Business Program Proposal from the agenda of the Commission on Higher Education. We did this because we were informed by Dean Kane that the program might jeopardize the accreditation of the College of Business. A committee was set up consisting of Susan Bridwell, John Olsgaard, Susan Foreman, John Gardner, Tom Lisk, and Jim Hilton with Tom Lisk and John Gardner as co-chairs. They put together a document for the College of Business Administration to show how the Sumter program satisfactorily addresses the AACSB accreditation criteria. Dean Anderson met with Dean Kane and the conclusion of the meeting is that we will invite an outside team to look at the program to evaluate the program as an AACSB undergraduate program.

FIPSE

Jim Edwards, Dave Bell, and I have been working with the campuses on this. Four Systemwide faculty meetings in Biology, English, Math, and History will be held this spring. These meetings will be supported by the Provost's Office. I am attaching a chart showing the faculty members from various campuses who have agreed to participate this summer, looking at basic courses in their discipline for content and accountability.

Budgets

As of February 15 the state cut all budgets another 1%. We will begin the next budget year with a base that reflects this cut plus the previous cuts. In addition, any salary raise given University employees would have to be found in the University's base budget.

Spring Enrollments

Enrollments on most campuses were up and in some cases quite a bit. The statistics are appended to this report.

REPORT OF THE VICE PROVOST  
February 21, 1992  
Page 2

Division Move

The Division will move to the Carolina Plaza Hotel sometime this summer. At the moment I am certain that we will move our administrative offices, Graduate Regional Studies, Distance Education, and Lifelong Learning. I still have some questions on whether to move the Library Processing Center. Next week, I will review our existing facilities with Charlie Jeffcoat of Facilities Management to determine how much space we will need in the hotel.

Lancaster Commencement

I am pleased to announce that through the efforts of Ralph Garris, the speaker will be Ambassador Saud Nasir Al-Sabah of Kuwait.

Bond Bill

The governor signed the bond bill which includes new projects such as the auditorium at Lancaster, the library at Sumter, and the Penn Center at Beaufort.

Campus Mailings

I have received several comments recently that there has been some trouble on the campuses with systemwide mailings. I have had Mary Kay Hall in my office look into this with the Printing Department. Beginning February 20, the Printing Department will call Mary Kay when a bulk mailing goes out from their office to the campuses for the next four systemwide mailings. Mary Kay will then call the campuses to let them know they are coming and the campus will then let Mary Kay know if they receive the materials. One difficulty on this matter is that some departments provide their own mailing lists and therefore we don't know exactly what type of distribution they use. After this trial period, if there are still problems, this matter will continue to be looked into.

Additional Attachment

You will find appended to this report a copy of the Fall 1991 AAUP/IPEDS Salary Data for the Regional Campuses.

**PARTICIPANTS IN THE FIPSE CORE CURRICULUM GRANT**

Campus	Biology	English	Math	History
USC-Beaufort			Ron Tuttle or Nora Schukei	
USC-Lancaster		Bruce Nims	Jerry Currence	
USC-Salkehatchie		Duncan McDowell ('92) Robert Group ('93)	Jeffrey Strong	Betty Youmans
USC-Sumter	John Logue	Tom Powers	John Varner	
USC-Union	Mary Barton	Tandy Willis		Allan Charles
USC-Columbia	Charles Duggins	William Rivers	Mary Ellen O'Leary	Robert Weir
USC-Aiken		Elizabeth Bell	Nieves McNulty	Elaine Lacy
USC-Coastal	Howard Kramer	Jill Sessoms or Veronica Gerald	Prashant Sansgiry	
USC-Spartanburg				

## ATTACHMENT 2D

\*\*1ST OFFICIAL as of 1/24/92\*\*

\*Includes 0.35% status 3's)

\*TE Does NOT include

Corresp., II or GRS\*\*\*

## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

## ENROLLMENT COMPARISON

\*SPRING 1991 vs. SPRING 1992

	HEADCOUNT		F.T.E.**		% CHANGE	
	AS OF 1/26/91	AS OF 1/24/92	Sp/Spl AS OF 1/26/91	Sp/Spl AS OF 1/24/92	HO.CT.	F.T.E.
Columbia U/G	14,428	14,494	12,991	13,242	.5	1.9
Law	784	766	823	812	-2.3	-1.3
D.Pharm.	16	48	50	48		
*Masters			2,583	2,727		5.6
*Doctoral			1,474	1,570		6.5
*Total Grad.	9,281	9,389			1.2	
Sub-Total	24,509	24,697	17,921	18,399	.8	2.7
Aiken	2,753	2,920	2,005	2,093	6.1	4.4
Coastal	3,562	3,488	2,875	2,849	-2.1	-.9
Spartanburg	3,238	3,331	2,485	2,574	2.9	3.6
Beaufort	885	1,050	406	489	18.6	20.4
Lancaster	938	963	556	566	2.7	1.8
Wheatchie	694	827	443	504	19.2	13.8
Winter	1,124	1,468	710	872	30.6	22.8
Union	369	387	202	220	4.9	8.9
Sub-Total	13,563	14,434	9,682	10,167	6.4	5.0
TOTAL	38,072	39,131	27,603	28,566	2.8	3.5
Med. School: M.D.	240	264	240	264	10.0	10.0
: Ph.D.	51	50	64	64	-2.0	.0
Total Med. School	291	314	304	328	7.9	7.9

\*\*Preliminary D.Pharm. Hdct included in U/G.

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

U/G = 15

DPHR = 15

Law = 14

Mast. = 12

Doct. = 9

\*GRS Excluded above (Previous = Jan.):

Masters:	624	610	-2.2
Doctoral:	244	231	-5.3
TOTAL GRS	868	841	-3.1

SOURCE: E61 Matrix Program.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research

cd - 1/27/92



## ATTACHMENT 2E

File

\*\*1ST OFFICIAL as of 1/24/92\*\*

(includes 0.33% status 3's)

\*\*\*FTE Does NOT include

Corresp., JI or GRS\*\*\*

## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

## ENROLLMENT COMPARISON

FALL 91 vs. SPRING 92

	HEADCOUNT		F.T.E.		% CHANGE	
	OFFICIAL AS OF 9/6/91	AS OF 1/24/92	Fall/F1 AS OF 9/6/91	Sp/Spl AS OF 1/24/92	HD.CT.	F.T.E.
Columbia U/G	16,059	14,494	14,441	13,242	-9.7	-8.3
Law	803	766	876	812	-4.8	-7.3
D.Pharm.	72	48	82	48		
*Masters			3,175	2,727		-14.1
*Doctoral			1,361	1,570		15.4
*Total Grad.	8,871	9,389			5.8	
Sub-Total	25,807	24,697	19,935	18,399	-4.3	-7.7
Aiken	3,108	2,920	2,267	2,093	-6.0	-7.7
Coastal	3,983	3,488	3,162	2,849	-12.4	-9.9
Spartanburg	3,525	3,331	2,740	2,574	-5.5	-6.1
Beaufort	1,023	1,050	491	489	2.6	-.4
Lancaster	1,039	963	626	566	-7.3	-9.6
Salkehatchie	935	827	547	504	-11.6	-7.9
Sumter	1,620	1,468	963	872	-9.4	-9.4
Union	393	387	218	220	-1.3	.9
Sub-Total	15,626	14,434	11,014	10,167	-7.6	-7.7
TOTAL	41,433	39,131	30,949	28,566	-5.6	-7.7
Med. School: M.D.	271	264	271	264	-2.6	-2.6
: Ph.D.	55	50	66	64	-9.1	-3.0
Total Med. School	326	314	337	328	-3.7	-2.7

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

U/G = 15

DPHR = 15

Law = 14

Mast. = 12

Doct. = 9

SOURCE: E61 Matrix Program.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research

\*GRS Excluded above (Previous = Sept.):

Masters:	444	610	37.3
Doctoral:	163	231	41.4
TOTAL GRS	608	841	38.4

## ATTACHMENT 2F

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FALL 1991 AAUP/IPEDS SALARY DATA - 4-YEAR CAMPUSES

	MALE			FEMALE			TOTAL			% Increase For Incumbents*	
	N	X \$	% TEN	N	X \$	% TEN	N	X \$	% F.B.	N	%
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
<b>COLUMBIA</b>											
9 Mos. (+10.5 Converted)											
PROF.	318	57,754	95.9	33	49,859	100.0	351	57,012		323	.2
ASSOC.	242	42,503	91.3	80	39,659	93.8	322	41,796		301	.9
ASST.	132	38,430	11.4	91	34,983	7.7	223	37,023		189	1.3
INSTR.	16	28,548	-	28	22,980	-	44	25,005		32	1.1
TOTAL	708	48,278		232	37,263		940	45,560	21.1	845	.6
11-12 Mos.											
PROF.	46	69,991	93.5	3	62,356	100.0	49	69,524		43	.8
ASSOC.	21	57,785	90.5	3	58,832	66.7	24	57,916		21	.9
ASST.	6	45,623	33.3	6	40,155	16.7	12	42,889		9	.9
INSTR.	12	36,515	-	14	27,320	-	26	31,564		17	7.6
TOTAL	85	60,530		26	37,960		111	55,243	19.9	90	1.5
<b>AIKEN</b>											
9 Mos. Equiv.											
PROF.	20	45,067	100.0	6	42,508	100.0	26	44,477		20	.5
ASSOC.	21	38,130	85.7	11	37,360	72.7	32	37,865		31	2.9
ASST.	17	30,496	-	19	32,119	31.6	36	31,352		32	2.1
INSTR.	4	26,574	-	10	25,476	-	14	25,790		7	1.2
TOTAL	62	37,529		46	33,283		108	35,721	22.6	90	1.9
<b>COASTAL</b>											
9 Mos. Equiv.											
PROF.	26	43,986	92.3	0	-	-	26	43,986		23	.0
ASSOC.	31	36,953	90.3	13	36,285	76.9	44	36,756		40	.6
ASST.	23	31,203	17.4	23	31,213	43.5	46	31,208		40	1.4
INSTR.	11	22,621	-	14	22,506	-	25	22,557		13	.8
TOTAL	91	35,777		50	30,094		141	33,761	22.8	116	.7
<b>SPARTANBURG</b>											
9 Mos. Equiv.											
PROF.	34	43,614	91.2	12	41,021	100.0	46	42,937		43	.2
ASSOC.	19	36,555	84.2	21	35,137	90.5	40	35,811		36	.9
ASST.	8	30,475	-	11	29,981	9.1	19	30,189		16	3.2
INSTR.	7	29,729	-	17	24,294	-	24	25,879		19	.4
TOTAL	68	38,667		61	32,343		129	35,676	22.5	114	.8

Conversion factors: 10.5 Mos. = 0.8571; 11-12 Mos. = 0.8182.

\* "Incumbent" includes only Faculty with same contract base for both years, counted at Fall 90 rank.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research.

C /17/92

## ATTACHMENT 2G

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FALL 1991 AAUP/IPEDS SALARY DATA - 2-YEAR CAMPUSES

	MALE			FEMALE			TOTAL			% Increase For Incumbents*	
	N	X \$	% TEN	N	X \$	% TEN	N	X \$	% F.B.	N	%
BEAUFORT	9 Mos. Equiv.										
PROF.	5	40,571	100.0	0	-	-	5	40,571		5	.0
ASSOC.	7	31,884	71.4	3	34,851	66.7	10	32,774		6	.0
ASST.	2	26,313	-	3	30,218	-	5	28,656		4	3.1
INSTR.	0	-	-	2	28,228	-	2	28,228		1	.0
TOTAL	14	34,191		8	31,458		22	33,197	22.9	16	.7
LANCASTER	9 Mos. Equiv.										
PROF.	3	39,949	100.0	2	41,304	100.0	5	40,491		3	.0
ASSOC.	11	33,381	90.9	4	34,411	50.0	15	33,656		12	1.2
ASST.	0	-	-	3	29,136	-	3	29,136		6	5.9
INSTR.	2	25,785	-	1	23,146	-	3	24,905		3	.0
TOTAL	16	33,663		10	33,081		26	33,439	22.9	24	2.0
SALKEHATCHIE	9 Mos. Equiv.										
PROF.	4	39,859	100.0	1	41,694	100.0	5	40,226		5	.0
ASSOC.	4	31,285	100.0	0	-	-	4	31,285		3	.0
ASST.	3	27,028	33.3	2	28,164	-	5	27,483		5	2.5
INSTR.	3	24,231	-	3	23,287	-	6	23,759		5	2.2
TOTAL	14	31,311		6	27,981		20	30,312	23.4	18	1.1
SUMTER	9 Mos. Equiv.										
PROF.	11	41,423	100.0	1	43,565	100.0	12	41,601		8	.0
ASSOC.	11	33,456	72.7	7	33,862	100.0	18	33,614		22	2.5
ASST.	6	31,737	16.7	1	27,257	-	7	31,097		6	.0
INSTR.	2	26,510	-	1	28,010	-	3	27,010		2	.0
TOTAL	30	35,570		10	33,587		40	35,074	21.2	38	1.4
UNION	9 Mos. Equiv.										
PROF.	4	39,875	100.0	0	-	-	4	39,875		3	.0
ASSOC.	2	31,046	50.0	1	38,000	100.0	3	33,364		4	3.8
ASST.	1	23,500	100.0	0	-	-	1	23,500		1	.0
INSTR.	1	23,728	-	1	25,773	-	2	24,751		2	.0
TOTAL	8	33,603		2	31,887		10	33,259	21.8	10	1.5

Conversion factors: 10.5 Mos. = 0.8571; 11-12 Mos. = 0.8182.

\*Incumbent includes only faculty with same contract base for both years, counted at Fall 90 rank.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research.

CD - 2/17/92

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE  
FEBRUARY 21, 1992  
USC-COLUMBIA

Provost Search Committee

The committee policy is that only the chair, Professor Don Greiner, is authorized to speak on behalf of the committee but I do feel it is professionally appropriate for me to say that I am doing the best I can to represent the interests, values, and concerns of the Regional Campuses faculty and the administration and I will certainly echo those sentiments very strongly when we begin interviewing final candidates. It has been reported in the press that we have approximately 150 applications and it looks to me to be a very decent applicant pool. One of the criteria we are looking for is multi-campus public university system experience and a genuine interest in undergraduate education and teaching. I hope that we will all be pleased with the outcome.

Status of the Faculty Manual Revision

Currently, the Manual is being reviewed in the Legal Office. It has gone through an exhaustive review process in this office and we have forwarded it with great confidence and respect.

Annual Freshman Year Experience Conference

I trust that by now you have all received your invitations to this annual gathering. You are welcome to attend any of the sessions from February 22-25. Your conference registration fees have been waived.

Affirmative Action Officer Search

I am also representing you on this committee for this System position. This is the third committee to attempt to find such an officer for the University. Currently, we have ads placed in appropriate national journals and are developing an applicant pool. President Palms has told the committee he wants to have the kind of individual with whom he will want to interact with on a daily basis. It is my prediction that he will be working much more closely with this position than any of our previous presidents.

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR  
February 21, 1992  
Page 2

Meetings of Academic and Student Affairs Deans

As has been our custom for a number of years, David Hunter and I meet once a semester with the Student Affairs Deans and the same with the Academic Affairs Deans. The Chair of the Faculty Senate is invited and welcome to attend any of these meetings. The Student Affairs Deans meet on February 28, and the Academic Affairs Deans meet on March 20. If any of you would like to present us any agenda items, we would welcome them.

BAIS Program

The College of Applied Professional Sciences has requested that the campuses' academic deans and I meet with APS officials to discuss our current procedures for implementing the standards of the BAIS degree. Of course, we are happy to do so. The College has some concerns about how some of its policies are being administered on our campuses and, of course, we wish to honor them to the letter. There is no real problem here but mainly a need for more regular communication about how we are achieving our important student objectives through this degree. We are optimistic that we will have a positive discussion and I shall report to you about this subsequent to our meeting on this topic on March 20.

# ATTACHMENT 4A

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
Associate in Science in Commercial Science

## General Education Requirements

ENGL 101, Composition .....	3
ENGL 102, Composition and Literature .....	3
HIST 110, Intro. to American History .....	3
PSYC 101, Introduction to Psychology .....	3
OADM 143, Intro. to Computer Keyboarding .....	3
OADM 144, Business Mathematics .....	3
OADM 342, Business Communications .....	3
RETL 149, Basic Economics .....	3
BADM 371, Principles of Management.....	3
RETL 351, Small Business Organization and Operation .....	3
PHIL 318, Business Ethics .....	3

\*Included in general education requirements because of basic math skills content.

\*Included in general education requirements because course content is beneficial to both options.

MATH, CSCI, or PHIL 110 ..... 3/4

\*Included because of recommendation of SAC Committee.

## Data Processing Option:

CSCI 101, Introduction to Computer Concepts .....	3
CSCI 102, General Applications in Programming .....	3
CSCI 205, Business Applications Programming .....	3
BADM 290, Computer Information Systems in Business .....	3
BADM 222, Survey of Accounting .....	3

\*Added to data processing option because students needed more programming experience.

\*Students in this option only need the survey course.

Electives ..... 9

## Accounting Option:

BADM 225, Fundamentals of Accounting I.....	3
BADM 226, Fundamentals of Accounting II .....	3
OADM 264, Computer Applications in Business.....	3
RETL 260, Income Tax Procedures .....	3
Electives .....	12

Total hours required

60/61 hrs.

# Academic Programs

---



The University of South Carolina at Lancaster offers the following academic degrees and programs:

Associate in Arts degree  
Associate in Science degree

Associate in Science degree in the following fields: Commercial Science, Secretarial Science, Technical Nursing, and Criminal Justice.

Two to three years of credit toward a baccalaureate degree in most areas.

## Associate Degree Programs

### Associate in Arts and Associate in Science Degree

The University of South Carolina at Lancaster offers the Associate in Arts degree and the Associate in Science degree to those students who have earned 60 hours of credit approved by the Dean of USC-Lancaster. These degrees are awarded to those students who have completed the following requirements.

**Associate in Arts (A.A.):** Successful completion of English 101, 102, or equivalent, and 54 additional semester hours.

**Associate in Science (A.S.):** Successful completion of English 101, 102, or equivalent, a minimum of six hours of mathematics, and 48 additional semester hours.

In addition to the requirements stated above, students must also meet the following criteria for an Associate in Arts or an Associate in Science degree.

1. 2.0 GPA (does not include course grades earned by challenge examinations);

## ATTACHMENT 4C

### 2. Final 15 semester hours earned at USC-Lancaster.

Many students who enter the Associate in Arts or the Associate in Science degree programs intend to apply these credits toward a baccalaureate degree. These students are advised to work closely with their academic advisers to outline a program of study for the first two years that will meet preliminary requirements of the four-year major they wish to pursue. A suggested program of study for the freshman and sophomore years along with details about degree requirements may be found in the section on "Baccalaureate Degree Programs."

#### Shorthand Option:

OADM 145 Shorthand I .....	3
OADM 146 Shorthand II .....	3
Electives .....	15

### Other Associate Degrees

In addition to the Associate in Arts and the Associate in Science degrees, USC-Lancaster offers associate degrees in the following fields: Commercial Science, Secretarial Science, Technical Nursing, and Criminal Justice. Outlines for each degree program are listed below.

#### Commercial Science Curriculum

##### General Education Requirements

ENGL 101 Composition .....	3
ENGL 102 Composition and Literature .....	3
HIST 110 Intro. to American History .....	3
PSYC 101 Introduction to Psychology .....	3
OADM 143 Introduction to Computer Keyboarding .....	3
RETL 149 Basic Economics .....	3
BADM 225 Fundamentals of Acct. I .....	3
BADM 226 Fundamentals of Acct. II .....	3
RETL 351 Small Business Organization & Operation .....	3
OADM 264 Computer Applications in Business .....	3
OADM 342 Business Communications .....	3
BADM 371 Principles of Management .....	3
	<u>36</u>

##### Data Processing Option:

MATH 100 An Introduction to Elementary Mathematics .....	3
CSCI 101 Introduction to Computer Concepts .....	3
CSCI 205 Business Applications Programming .....	3
BADM 290 Introduction to Data Processing or	
CSCI 140 (with the permission of the instructor) .....	3
Electives .....	12
	<u>24</u>

##### Accounting Option:

OADM 144 Business Mathematics .....	3
RETL 260 Income Tax Procedures or	
BADM 335 Survey of Federal Taxation .....	3
PHIL 318 Business Ethics .....	3
Electives .....	15
	<u>24</u>

#### Secretarial Science Curriculum

##### General Education Requirements

ENGL 101 Composition .....	3
ENGL 102 Composition and Literature .....	3
PSYC 101 Introductory Psychology .....	3
HIST 110 Introduction to American History .....	3
RETL 149 Basic Economics .....	3
OADM 141 Typewriting I .....	3
OADM 142 Typewriting II .....	3
OADM 144 Business Math .....	3
RETL 161 Functional Accounting I .....	3
OADM 160 Records Control .....	3
OADM 247 Secretarial Procedures .....	3
OADM 342 Business Communications .....	3
OADM 264 Computer Applications in Business .....	3
	<u>39</u>

##### Word Processing Option:

OADM 242 Machine Dictation and Transcription .....	3
OADM 243 Word Processing Concepts and Technology .....	3
OADM 238 Advanced Typewriting .....	3
Electives .....	12
	<u>21</u>



**ASSOCIATE DEGREE NURSING PROGRAM**  
**(Joint Program with York Technical College)**

**IMPLEMENTED SUMMER 1992**

**FIRST SEMESTER**

BIOL 243	Anatomy and Physiology I .....	03
BIOL 243L	Anatomy and Physiology I Lab .....	01
LANU 120	Basic Nursing Concepts .....	07
ENGL 101	Composition .....	03
PSYC 101	Introduction to Psychology .....	03
		<u>17</u>

**SECOND SEMESTER**

BIOL 244	Anatomy and Physiology II .....	03
BIOL 244L	Anatomy and Physiology II Lab .....	01
LANU 220	Family Centered Nursing .....	07
MATH 111	Basic College Mathematics .....	03
		<u>14</u>

**THIRD SEMESTER (Normally Summer)**

LANU 214	Mental Health Nursing .....	04
BIOL 330	Microbiology I .....	03
BIOL 330L	Microbiology I Lab .....	01
		<u>08</u>

**FOURTH SEMESTER**

LANU 121	Intermediate Nursing Concepts .....	08
ENCL 102	Composition and Literature .....	03
	Humanities Elective .....	03
		<u>14</u>

**FIFTH SEMESTER**

LANU 221	Advanced Nursing Concepts .....	05
LANU 215	Management of Patient Care .....	05
	Elective(s) .....	04-06
		<u>14-16</u>

## ATTACHMENT 5B

**COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR  
REVISED CURRICULUM****LANU 120. BASIC NURSING CONCEPTS (07).**

The application of the nursing process in the care of persons throughout the life span who are experiencing selected common health problems.

**LANU 121. INTERMEDIATE NURSING CONCEPTS (08).**

Expanded application of the nursing process in the care of persons throughout the life span who are experiencing common health problems.

**LANU 214. MENTAL HEALTH NURSING (04).**

The utilization of the nursing process to assist in meeting the needs of patients with common mental health problems. Focus is on the dynamics of human behavior, ranging from normal to extreme.

**LANU 215. MANAGEMENT OF PATIENT CARE (05).**

The examination of nursing care of small groups of patients utilizing the nursing process and concepts of management.

**LANU 220. FAMILY CENTERED NURSING (07).**

The application of the nursing process in the care of persons during the child-bearing years and from birth through adolescence to promote optimal individual health and development at any stage of the health continuum.

**LANU 221. ADVANCED NURSING CONCEPTS (05).**

The application of the nursing process in the care of persons throughout the life cycle who are experiencing complex health problems.

**LANU 299. INDEPENDENT STUDY (01-06).****THE FOLLOWING COURSE WILL BE PART OF THE CURRICULUM DURING THE PERIOD  
OF TRANSITION****LANU 125. CONCEPTS AND SKILLS OF NURSING WITH THE CHILDBEARING FAMILY (05).**

Study of the components of desirable physical and mental health, the resources and techniques for promoting and maintaining health, and the nurse's responsibility for health maintenance.

**NOTE:** The courses listed above are intended specifically for students enrolled in the associate degree program in technical nursing and are not regularly applicable to baccalaureate degree requirements.

**COURSES TO BE DELETED FROM THE CURRICULUM EFFECTIVE FALL 1992:**

- LANU 131. FUNDAMENTALS OF NURSING (06).
- LANU 132. NURSING IN HEALTH MAINTENANCE AND FAMILY DEVELOPMENT (09).
- LANU 231. NURSING IN PHYSICAL AND MENTAL ILLNESS I (09).
- LANU 232. NURSING IN PHYSICAL AND MENTAL ILLNESS II (09).
- LANU 234. NURSING SEMINAR (03).

ATTACHMENT 5C

November 12, 1991

To: Barbara Kellogg, MN Nurse Program Consultant  
State Board of Nursing for South Carolina

From: Francine Manion, MSN, Director York Tech-USC-L AD  
Nursing Program

Subject: Responses to questions regarding curriculum for semester conversion

1. The rationale for selecting the nursing courses submitted is that our curriculum is integrated. The courses chosen reflect this integration. Also reflected in the courses is our philosophy, program objectives and conceptual framework. Due to the integrated nature of the curriculum block courses are not acceptable.
2. The courses will be taught as follows:

1st semester	NUR 120 Basic Nursing Concepts	7 semester hours
2nd semester	NUR 220 Family Centered Nursing	7 semester hours
3rd semester	NUR 214 Mental Health Nursing	4 semester hours
4th semester	NUR 121 Intermediate Nursing Concepts	8 semester hours
5th semester	NUR 221 Advanced Nursing Concepts	5 semester hours
	NUR 215 Management of Patient Care	5 semester hours
3. Basic med-surg will be taught in NUR 120, Basic Nursing Concepts. Students will be introduced to the nursing process in class and in caring for patients with medical-surgical common health problems in acute and long term care settings. Necessary technical skills will be taught in practice lab. Concepts covered will include basic physical assessment, assessment of homeostasis through evaluation of vital signs (normal parameters and deviations, diagnostic procedures, asepsis, hygiene, safety, mobility, elimination (bowel and bladder), rest, sleep and pain, nutrition, fluid, electrolyte, acid-base balance and imbalance, oxygenation, perioperative care and pharmacology and medication administration. These are all basic concepts that are related to all levels of patient care.

## ATTACHMENT 5D

Page Two

Memorandum to Barbara Kellogg

November 12, 1991

4. Growth and development of the adult through senescence will be taught in NUR 120, Basic Nursing Concepts, and reinforced in NUR 214, Mental Health Nursing, NUR 121, Intermediate Nursing Concepts and NUR 221, Advanced Nursing Concepts when health problems are taught. Growth and development of the child from birth through adolescence will be taught in NUR 220, Family Centered Nursing, and reinforced as it relates to the child's reaction to hospitalization and illness in NUR 120, Intermediate Nursing Concepts and NUR 121, Advanced Nursing Concepts.
5. Trends and issues will be covered in NUR 215, Management of Patient Care. Included will be concepts of management and leadership; education preparation for practice; roles of the nurses in practice; quality assurance/risk management; systems of nursing practice; legal and care delivery system; nursing and politics; rising health care costs and cost containment; licensure, credentialing, agency accreditation. These will be presented in relation to management of patient care.
6. The changes in curriculum, as submitted, were approved by faculty November 12, 1991.
7. Number of seats per year for admission into semester system: 36 York Tech, 20 USC-L, total 56. We only admit once a year in fall semester.



ATTACHMENT 6A

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA CAMPUS

Department of Geological Sciences

Columbia, SC 29208

28 February 1992

Dr. Robert Costello

USC - Sumter  
200 Miller Rd.  
Sumter, S.C. 29150

Dear Dr. Costello,

You will find attached our final proposed version of Academic Forgiveness for Former Students. Your committee should carefully review the proposed policy and if you support the idea to present this for approval to the Faculty Senate for the regional campuses at its meeting in early April. Please feel free to modify the rationale as it would best suit the issues at the regional campuses. I will be happy to assist you with the proposal in anyway that I can. If you think it would be helpful, I would be happy to attend the meeting of your senate to answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Willard E. Sharp, Chair  
Scholastic Standards and Petitions

tlf 777-6929  
fax 777-6610

cc: Faculty Senate Office

## ATTACHMENT 6B

### REPORT OF THE SCHOLASTIC STANDARDS AND PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

The committee, working in conjunction with Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committees from each of the System campuses and from the individual Colleges, has formulated an academic forgiveness policy for former students. If each of the system senates adopts this proposal, we will have a unified coherent policy that will give equitable consideration to all our former students.

#### Rationale

Academic forgiveness for former students offers those who have left the university an opportunity to return with a reasonable chance to complete a degree. Many capable individuals have a disastrous first time experience at the university because they lack maturity, experience a personal crisis, or choose an unsuitable major. Such individuals often give up precipitously, leaving a record with a large number of deficit points, thus making it impossible for them to ever attain an acceptable GPA. Under present regulations, no relief is permitted, no matter how long ago these academic difficulties occurred. In fact, some deans find it necessary to advise mature students who would like to return and complete a degree that their only recourse is to attend another university where they would be treated as a transfer student. At present we often treat transfer students better than we do our former students. The attached forgiveness program was developed for students who have left the university, had life maturing experiences, and would now like to return to the university. This policy does not address the problems of currently enrolled students with marginal GPAs, a different issue

## ATTACHMENT 6C

which should be considered separately. The purpose of this policy is to bring equity to the way we treat transfer students and our former students.

Specific advantages of this form of forgiveness are:

1. It requires a definite amount of life maturing experience.
2. It requires that the student demonstrate serious progress in a university program.
3. It does not force a student to repeat courses in order to achieve forgiveness, as do many other forms of forgiveness.
4. It does not require a student to repeat courses which contain material that has been adequately mastered.
5. It would encourage transfer students with previous USC work to return to USC for completion of their degree.
6. It is sufficiently flexible to be enforced as a university regulation while recognizing the prerogatives of individual colleges and programs in maintaining standards that are more stringent than the University's.

The committee requests that the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate at the University of South Carolina approve the attached policy on "Academic Forgiveness for Former Students."

## ATTACHMENT 6D

### ACADEMIC FORGIVENESS FOR FORMER STUDENTS

Academic Forgiveness means that students' past failures are forgiven to allow them to resume their college careers with a realistic possibility of completing a degree. In essence, the program will allow the calculation of a grade point average (GPA) based on the student's performance in courses taken after being granted forgiveness.

A student who meets all of the following conditions may apply for academic forgiveness:

1. The student was not enrolled at <sup>any</sup> the University of South Carolina campus for at least 48 months.
2. The student must be readmitted to a degree program at the University of South Carolina and must complete at least 24 hours of approved graded coursework prior to applying for academic forgiveness.
3. After readmission to the university, the student must earn a cumulative GPA of at least 2.000 and meet the progression requirements of her/his degree program.
4. The student has not previously been granted academic forgiveness.

A student who has met these conditions and desires academic forgiveness must submit a written request for academic forgiveness to the Dean of the College in which the student is enrolled. After verification of the student's eligibility, the Dean shall inform the Registrar that academic forgiveness has been granted to the student.



ATTACHMENT 6E

Once academic forgiveness has been granted, the following apply to the student's academic record:

1. All curriculum requirements will be in accordance with those in force subsequent to the student's readmission.
2. The student may not receive Academic Honors upon graduation.
3. The student's grade point average is recalculated beginning with the semester in which the student was readmitted to the university.
4. Courses in which the student received a passing grade prior to readmission and the granting of academic forgiveness may, at the discretion of the student's college, be used for academic credit, but are not used in the calculation of the grade point average.
5. The following statement shall appear on the academic record of any student granted academic forgiveness: "This student was granted academic forgiveness under the University of South Carolina Academic Forgiveness Program. No courses taken prior to \_\_\_\_\_ are used in the calculation of the GPA, but those in which the student received a passing grade may be applied to meeting degree requirements."
6. The permanent academic record will remain an unmodified record of all work attempted at the University of South Carolina.

TO: Regional Campus Faculty Senate

FROM: John Catalano

DATE: February 21, 1992

SUBJECT: The USC Faculty Senate Library Committee meeting of  
December 6, 1991, 3 p.m.

- I. The Dean of Libraries convened the meeting and gave the Dean's report.
  - A. Early Spring introduction of Uncover Database - a rapid delivery system.
  - B. TC Society doing well in its second year. Please join.
  - C. Expanded hours in TC's Computer Lab.
  - D. New film preview room at TCL.
  - E. Serials prices up dramatically. Possible cuts.
  - F. TC named one of 8 U.S.A. sites for fiction cataloging by Library of Congress.
  - G. New items to be discussed at future meetings:
    1. Library carol assignments and possible revocation.
    2. General discussion of space needs.
- II. Discussion concerning Library Provision for Undergraduate Education.
- III. Next meeting February 7, 3 p.m.

UNABLE TO ATTEND BECAUSE OF ILLNESS.

JC

ATTACHMENT 8

Robert Castleberry  
Courses & Curriculum Committee

Again, I would remind the senators that final changes to courses or the curriculum are approved by the Columbia Senate and, thus, appear in their minutes.

The committee has recommended several changes of potential importance:

- 1) a number of history courses have been deleted
- 2) some 600-level American history courses are now at the 400-level
- 3) the ENGR curriculum will be changed

I would also like to thank Harold Sears at Union, Frank Shelton from Salkehatchie and Lila Meeks at Beaufort for their feedback on the proposed history changes. For everyone's information the HIST 514 course will be dropped (the History Department feels the course material is outdated). Fortunately, I understood that there is some progress in getting History to come up with some new courses that can be offered at the Regional Campuses (through telecommunications).

As a point of information, when new courses are proposed, or course deletions suggested, or (in some cases) curricula altered, other departmental schools are often consulted for their approval. Often, departments anticipate this procedure and secure letters of support to accompany their proposal. Our campuses may wish to consider this approach.

Faculty Welfare Committee report

The committee met Monday, January 20, and discussed the following issues:

**\* Outside Professional Activities:**

Arlene Andrews will be convening the faculty ad hoc committee in order to begin reviewing the new policy statement on outside professional activity

**\* Parking Problem:**

The committee continues to stress faculty priority in campus parking assignments. The Faculty Welfare Committee now plans to go before the Faculty Senate as well as the Parking Committee to express its views on this issue

**\* Summer Salaries:**

No progress to date--since the provost's office is at present "acting" none is anticipated until a provost is hired

**\* Sexual Harassment:**

Extensive correspondence in the committee's files was reviewed. It was resolved that the committee suggest that a Sexual Harassment officer be appointed as soon as possible and that the individual not be affiliated with the university's legal staff.

**\* Asbestos removal:**

The chairman will review the report presented to the committee last year and will continue to monitor progress in this area

**\* Smoking:**

The committee suggests that the USC smoking regulations be distributed yearly as a reminder

Submitted by Susan Pauly, USC-Lancaster  
February 21, 1992

Lowry - how your records, minutes.  
Mike



ATTACHMENT 10

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S.C. 29208

DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

(803) 777-8155

TO: Regional Campuses Faculty Senate  
FROM: Mike Schoen <sup>MS</sup>  
DATE: February 21, 1992  
SUBJ: Report from the Academic Planning Committee

The committee met November 25th and January 20th since my last report to this faculty senate. What has emerged from an earlier discussion of the role and function of the Academic Planning Committee is a proposal (which has now been reviewed by the Executive Committee of this faculty senate) to replace the existing System Academic Planning and System Academic Policy Coordinating Committees with a singular, new "System Academic Advisory Committee". The proposal, which will be voted on in our next meeting on Monday, February 24th here in Columbia, calls for no new powers as such (it will still be advisory to the President), but does call for representation that appears to be beneficial to the regional campuses. A total committee membership of 17 is proposed, with one representative from each of the five regional campuses, two representatives from Aiken, Coastal and Spartanburg, five from Columbia, and one student representative.

I would welcome any additional comments or questions from the campuses and senators that are here today to supplement those that I have already received from the Executive Committee. In general, the sentiment seems to be positive towards the proposal, which, if approved in Mondays meeting, will be forwarded to the President.



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
AT SUMTER

200 Miller Road  
Sumter, S.C. 29150-2498

Telephone:  
(803) 775-6341

February 20, 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Regional Campuses/Faculty Senate  
FROM: Kay Oldhouser *KOO*  
SUBJECT: Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee

The Academic Affairs/Faculty Liaison Committee met February 6 at USC-Spartanburg. This was the first of two meetings this year that will be held away from the Columbia campus. The committee approved five new program proposals. Three of these were for M.Ed. degrees to be granted by Coastal Carolina. These represent the first graduate degrees to be offered by Coastal. USC-Aiken and USC-Spartanburg are expected to submit similar proposals this spring.

The lengthy discussion of the Coastal proposal again emphasized the need to provide detailed financial information in any new program proposal submitted to this committee. In addition, it is going to be necessary to show how any new programs fit within the mission of the System. The committee does not want to consider any more new program proposals until the System Mission Statement has been adopted.

Report: Savannah River Review Committee  
John F. Logue, February 21, 1992

The Savannah River Review Committee met, with Dr. Tamir Datta presiding, Jan. 14, 1992 at 4:00 pm in room 404A of the Physical Science Center Columbia Campus. Dr. Paul Huray, Vice Provost for Research, reported to the committee on the relationship between SCUREF, DOE funding and several other projects in which the University is participating. It was stated that one of the problems associated with financial support from WSRC through SCUREF is that awards are contractual rather than grants. If DOE, for example, holds up contracts to WSRC, contracts through SCUREF to faculty and research staff are also held up and that there is no back pay for the delay period. This, in all probability creates greatest hardship on arrangements involving graduate research assistants.

Dr. Huray also reported that there was no connection between SCUREF and DOE's funding of the consortium which will link USC with a new supercomputer research center at Oak Ridge National Laboratories (reported in February USC Times). He expressed hope, however, that data collection which is funded by SCUREF can be made to interface with the computer modeling to be associated with the supercomputer project. Much of the other discussion by committee members related to the status of the Distinguished Scientist Program and research parks at Clemson, Charleston, and Columbia.

Toward the end of the meeting, committee members were asked for a candid appraisal of the representation by Regional Campuses on the Savannah River Review Committee. The question was prefaced with a recognition that the committee had evolved from a point where faculty were questioning the wisdom of the University's affiliation with the nuclear industry to concern almost solely related to oversight of the financial relationship and the possibility of undue influence over research and/or research departments. In response committee members viewed the inclusion of the Regional Campuses as a furthering of the system concept and urged that I encourage our campuses to take advantage of the opportunities for funding through SCUREF.

It should be noted in this connection that the original agreement between SCUREF and Westinghouse Savannah River Company provided for the development of four themes: research, a Distinguished Scientist Program, a Technology Transfer Program, and a Science and Mathematics Education Initiative. The last of the three has been in the planning stages for some time but will perhaps ultimately represent greater potential access to these resources for our campuses.

Should anyone on the Regional Campuses have research or project ideas that can in any way be tied to SCUREF activities, they should contact Dr. D.J. Colquhoun, who is the current technical representative for USC to SCUREF.