

**REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**FEBRUARY 14, 1997**  
**USC LANCASER**

Morning session

Professor Jerry Dockery (Continuing Education), Chair, called the meeting to order and recognized Joe Pappin Dean of the University, USC Lancaster in order for him to introduce Rep. Billy Boan, guest speaker.

Dean Pappin welcomed the Senate to the Lancaster campus and called the attention of the body to a display of plans for the new Arts & Sciences and Performing Arts Center, which is scheduled for completion in May, 1999. The new building will include twelve new faculty offices. Another development at USC Lancaster has been updating of the computer labs.

Dean Pappin noted that Rep. Boan is a product of USC Lancaster. He recognized Susan Snipes and Earlene Horton for their roles in encouraging young Billy Boan to stay in school and complete his studies at times when he was discouraged. He thanked Rep. Boan for his role in securing the \$2.7 million State appropriation for the new building and for suggesting that it could be enhanced by a little fund-raising. The result has been a joint effort of the campus and the community which has increased the funds for the new building to over \$9 million. Cited for their special efforts in this fund-raising effort were campaign chair Charlie Bundy, Susan Pauly, and Ralph Garris.

Representative Billy Boan responded: This project has been the most rewarding thing that I've been involved in in my 15th year in Columbia. Our entire community embraced and supported this project like nothing else that has ever happened here; and I think that is what we're going to have to see in the future, especially from our two year campuses system if we keep the status in the State and in the University System that we want to enjoy. In every community that you serve, every community where you are located you have assets that need to be tapped. You need to have partnerships with local government, the University, the State, and the private sector to do some of the things we've done here. It certainly helped us recently when we were discussing the next bond bill that we will be taking up soon as we told the story of the Lancaster community's commitment to this project; and the bond committee responded by committing some additional funds to an expansion of the Medford Library here on campus. I will tell you that in the future that's what the Legislature is going to look to and the Administration is going to look to especially at our two year campuses.

I'd like to talk a few minutes about where we are in the budget process; and then I'd be glad to answer questions. Denny Nielsen

from Darlington and Bill Reiser from Richland County serve on the Higher Education Subcommittee which I chair. We'll be making our recommendations to the full committee (the Ways & Means Committee) and begin our budget process next week. The Governor's budget really didn't include any new money for education and a 3% pay raise would have been required to come out of the existing budgets, which in effect is a 3% cut on operations budget to make that happen; and of course the pay plan was not for higher ed, it was for all of State Government. Wisely, I think, our committee leadership has rejected that idea; and I believe we've got to come up with that pay increase outside of our budgets. We're looking at about a 2 1/2% increase in pay; and that is our goal as we begin our work this week. We do have money in the budget for maintenance of buildings; there should be some money available to all the campuses.

One of the things I would like to mention would be our scholarship program. Two scholarship programs were created last year with money from the Chem Nuclear operation at Barnwell. We had hoped it would generate about \$21 million, but it is only about \$17 million. We'll be looking at ways to enhance that program. Even if we don't have money from the tax on nuclear waste we'll be able to do it with general fund dollars so we can keep that program in place. Eighteen percent of that money goes to private colleges. There is a movement among the private colleges to try to get a larger percentage. I'm hopeful that we'll be able to maintain it as it is because for the first time we were able to offer needs based scholarships to students in South Carolina's public colleges and we also enhanced the Palmetto Scholarship program as well.

Other issues of some interest to you as faculty members are the move to increase oversight over your computer activities and decreased paperwork in seeking grant money.

The one other thing I will mention is the Legislature's efforts to create a performance based distribution of funds. The Commission and the Council of Presidents have agreed that in this year any new money would be divided 25% towards this performance formula that has been created over this past year and 75% toward parity, parity being related to the freeze in formula in 1990-91. The 75% of the new money would go to equalize that money on a formula basis when everybody was on the same formula. But in the future, the Legislature has directed that in two years all of the money be based on performance funding. I will tell you that our motives are genuine. The side effects may cause some questions. We are plowing new territory, not just for South Carolina, but nationally. There is really no other standard like it in the nation, we are told.

I'll, try to answer any questions.

Professor Bob Costello (Sumter): I'd like to ask a question about something I heard in the news last night, and that was that our long time enemy, Fred Sheheen, who has been detrimental to higher education for about a quarter of a century is now questioning the integrity of the search process for his successor. He says he doesn't want to participate in the process but wants the job. I wonder if you could comment for us on what's going on there.

Representative Boan: I had a reporter call me; apparently he (Fred) wrote all the members of the Legislature, and that's what the news report was in response to. I really don't know a lot about the letter. I didn't see it, she was going to send me a copy of it, but I didn't get it before I left Columbia yesterday. I can't really speak to that because I don't know a great deal about the letter. My sense is just from what I've heard and read in the news reports is that the search committee is going to find somebody else for that job; and I don't have any inside information on that other than my instincts.

Tom Powers, Interim Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, USC Sumter: You say that performance funding is going to be here in toto in two years, yet the Commission's plan for implementing the program only lets us do fourteen indicators in the coming year, twenty six the year after that; it will be three years before all the indicators can be in place. How is it that the Legislature intends to do 100% performance funding in two years when all the indicators won't be in place until three years?

Representative Boan: I should have said two years from now. Let me tell you their rationale, which I believe would be sound, for moving into it over a period of time. One, is it's a drastic change in the way we're doing things now and I think they're allowing us to make our mistakes slowly. More importantly, there are lots of things that are not measurable or extremely difficult to measure; and what they've done with these fourteen items is to pick those that are easy to measure: SAT scores, faculty workloads, data that the institutions have at their fingertips. It's just a matter of pulling it together. It will take a while on these other indicators.

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): What is the attitude of the Legislature at this time generally toward higher education in this State? Is it getting any more positive? Are we making any headway?

Representative Boan: You know, that would have a variety of answers, I guess, depending on who you talk to. I think that there may be a general attitude that we have too many campuses, that faculty members don't carry a heavy enough work load, administration wastes too much money. Help me; you've heard them all, too. Sometimes those things are fueled by small events that make big news. There may be one institution in this State that

needs \$10 million for a science building, yet the local interest is about a \$32 basketball ticket. That's what makes the news, yet we are educating our science teachers to teach our public school students in a 1950's science lab. It really only takes one mistake to reprioritize the focus. But I think, generally, these are some of the concerns that you hear critics of higher education speak to. I think that everybody recognizes the need for a good strong higher education program. There is a concern about duplication rather than having concern about historical problems and access which is what I think we all stand for. I think there is a concern about the number of campuses. I spoke at a Rotary Club in Bennettsville one time - Marlboro County - and I had a question about the 33 campuses (probably more than that). Some tech schools have 3 or 4 campuses each. I get this question about how many campuses we've got and can we afford these campuses. My answer was that 10% of my constituents have a Baccalaureate degree. How can we not make it as available as possible? So, it's just a matter of priorities, like everything else. Some of the problems we've had that we haven't been able to control would be growth in our prison population that competes for our dollars. Until recently the Federal courts drove a lot of money that we spend in corrections. Also in health care areas Federal matching dollars come to South Carolina. There is competition for the dollars at the State level. It would disappoint us all to compare the percentage of the State budget that has gone to higher education, how it has dwindled over the last ten years. It has been easy for the Legislature to shift that to the students' tuition fees; and many other competitors don't have anywhere else to turn. I think the Legislature recognizes the need for higher education and its importance in the State; but I think there are lots of factors you need to consider. There is a public relations problem that I believe may be better than it once was. I think the reason for the performance funding movement is that there is a belief by those who are most supportive of that that the strong will survive and the weak will - you know: the marketplace will put them out of business. I don't know if I answered your question. That was kind of a political speech, wasn't it?

Professor Jerry Dockery (Continuing Education): Mr. Boan, why is it that the Legislature always seems to refuse to listen to people who are experts and work in a field? An example is Judge Michael Davis, who often is a guest lecturer in my criminology classes. He has cited examples of how actions of the Legislature drive up costs for his court and for keeping people in facilities. Mandatory sentencing is one of the dumbest things that's been done in the history of mankind; but they keep on doing it.

Representative Boan: Well, it goes back to what I said earlier. I think the Legislature feels like they're responding to another constituency that says we want to get tough on crime. Believe me,

in South Carolina we are tough on crime. We lock 'em up; and we're doing what the public wants. Unfortunately, the public doesn't want to pay for it.

Professor Dockery: If they just called in a couple of magistrates and asked what the effects would be... Doesn't the Legislature have the backbone to go back to constituents and say "I understand your concerns, now if we do what you want to do here are going to be the other effects?" I mean, for every function, there are also dysfunctions.

Representative Boan: You understand the process and I know you know the answer to your own question; but it's just not that easy to do that when you have a political campaign. Political campaigns are the worst, because we go through a campaign and tell all South Carolina how bad the problems are in this State; and for six months everybody listens to them on the radio and watches on TV on how bad the problems are in a certain area. And you know, after six months of it, they believe it. Add to that the candidates talking about each other and how sorry we are - and of course that really builds confidence in government too. Then after we get down there we've got to respond to all those areas that we've convinced the public are so bad during the campaign season; so it's kind of a cycle. It really takes somebody to stand up in a position of leadership and say "Here are the facts." Too often in a political environment, that's absent.

Professor John Catalano (Lancaster): Have you heard anything else about Herb Kirsch's bill to do away with tenure and whether that will be revived any time soon?

Representative Boan: I don't think so. I think that those who represent you all in Columbia for the various colleges have proved that that idea is not going to get far.

Professor Dockery (Continuing Education): Actually, there is a threat at the Florence campus. Francis Marion is in an absolute turmoil right now. They are losing faculty, the President is keeping two sets of books; and the Legislative Audit Council needs to get their butt over there and find out what's really going on.

Numerous unidentified individuals: laughter

Representative Boan: Well, you need to tell Herb Kirsch about it; he'll insure that that happens.

Numerous unidentified individuals: more laughter

Representative Boan: There's always somebody that will bring in the Legislative Audit Council for their expertise, whatever that is. I never have had much confidence in the Legislative Audit

Council myself.

Dr. Duffy: I really don't think we ought to call in the Legislative Audit Council on anybody...

Representative Boan: I tried to eliminate them a couple of years ago. I guess I paid the price for that in the last few weeks.

Professor Steve Bishoff (Sumter): In talking about being responsive to constituencies, this constituency has pretty much portrayed Fred as the educational Antichrist., and we can't seem to get the Legislature tough on the CHE particularly, even though they'll get tough on us. What are we doing wrong?

Representative Boan: Well, first of all CHE is in a state of transition too. We feel like we've got a new CHE so I think what we would all want to do is allow the new CHE to grow up; and let's see if all those things we heard from you folks, trustees, and administrators when we recreated the CHE last years solves some of the problems we've had with CHE in the past. I'm not sure I really understand your question; would you follow up on that?

Professor Bishoff: I don't see where we exerted enough force, because Fred's still there and he still interprets as he sees fit, it seems. It would appear, at least to a distant observer, that he has manipulated the performance indicators the way he wants to in large part. Some of them have lost the logical force that they should have had because there is distrust of how he'll use them against us. I don't think you're going to seal the trust gap between higher educators and Fred Sheheen, perhaps a new figure...

Representative Boan: I think it's still a little early to pass judgement on that. Apparently there's a lot going on recently about the dynamics of CHE and the staff at CHE; so I think we probably ought to give that a little time to play out and see how that goes. If USC doesn't have strong representation on CHE with the former chairman of its Board (Eddie Floyd), then I don't know if you ever will.

Professor Brad Wagner (Beaufort): To follow up in terms of CHE's transition, my observation in the past has been that CHE should be an implementation arm of the Legislature's policy of education; and rather than that they seem to be more of a policy-making body. In terms of the future, what can the Legislature do to insure that they are implementers and not policy-makers?

Representative Boan: Well, I think one of the traditional battles of CHE's role has been what kind of authority they have; what kind of teeth to they have. Frankly, Boards of Trustees have always resisted that. We have had a strong trustee system in this State both in terms of their influence on their campuses and

politically; and I think traditionally that has been the way the Legislature has been comfortable with it rather than give CHE oversight authority that would have punitive powers if their recommendations weren't carried out. I just think historically that hasn't been something that the Legislature has been willing to give CHE the authority to do. The effort to change, to recreate CHE was to give the colleges more input at that level and I think if there seems to be some consensus built at that level it may be indeed that the Legislature will give CHE more authority than it now has. Although I know from the University's viewpoint CHE is a pretty strong entity; the Legislature will be quick to disregard a CHE recommendation.

Professor Ralph Garris (Lancaster): In terms of lobbying clout is the University more effective or is it the tech schools? When something is coming up do we move quickly enough or does Tech outmaneuver us?

Representative Boan: I don't know that you can just generally speak to a situation like that... There is nothing more effective than lobbying. I don't mean lobbying in the sense that we allow the press to characterize lobbying. I'm talking about lobbying in the sense that you act as lobbyists for your cause yourselves. I don't know how many of you know your legislators in your community personally; but if you don't you ought not criticize what's being done for your campus. You ought to take some responsibility yourself to find out who's representing you in Columbia and get to know them. When you've got something on your mind tell them rather than lay that blame at somebody else's feet for not performing on our behalf. I would say to you that to enhance lobbying of the University System you all have a responsibility to have folks like me on your campus or you visit them at their offices and let them know some of the problems you have and what you do. I couldn't say that the University lobbyist takes a back seat to anybody. Rarely does the University fail on what it wants to get. Now there may be some discussion within the System on what the priorities are, but once it gets to us ... you know.

Vice Provost John Duffy: you are one of the people in Columbia who really does have a statewide perspective, not only on this issue but on many others, which is something I think we're seeing less and less of. I do want to say on behalf of this group that may not know you as well as I do, that you are the top friend of higher education.

Representative Boan: I appreciate that, John.

Representative Boan was applauded by the Senate.

Chair Jerry Dockery dispersed the Senate to standing committee meetings.

## Afternoon session

### I. Call to Order

Professor Jerry Dockery called the meeting to order

### II. Correction and Approval of Minutes: November 15, 1996 USC Union

The minutes of November 15, 1996 were approved as submitted.

### III. Reports from University Officers

#### A. Dr. John Duffy, Vice Provost & Executive Dean

Mary Macdonald, Sue Hooks from the Business Office and I have been visiting the five campuses doing budget reviews; and I am pleased to announce that all the campuses budgets are in balance at this point in time. That's unusual, but it's rather heartening.

One interesting phenomenon which occurred in Columbia but it seems to have occurred on the other campuses... Our Spring enrollments and our collections from Spring enrollments seem to be higher than what we had predicted; and in Columbia that's very important because we were faced with a half a percent budget cut because of what appeared to be in the Fall a significant decline not in enrollment but in collections.

My strategic plan for the Division has been sent on to the Provost; the strategic plans from each campus have been sent on. These plans, incidentally, are open to anyone. My inclination were it possible would be to put them on the network so that people can look at them. The major thing that I ask for in my strategic plan that relates to you is the restoration of the line for the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

You already have received a legislative update that is far more current than any I could have offered you. I was very pleased to hear Rep. Boan talk about the 5% increase in FTE funding. The 75-25 issue is... I think if we were to get that much money then the debate between 75-25 and 50-50 would take on some significance; but from what he said it looks to me like 75-25 will be it.

The last candidate for Provost, a fellow named Cary Grant, was on campus this last week. The President I think expects the Search Committee to give him a recommendation. Probably if he runs true to form, he'll want a minimum of two and perhaps three.



I want to compliment those of you who submitted files this year. They are in very good shape; and I trust that we won't have very many problems with them.

The Freshman Year Experience will be run in Columbia February 21-25 and the Adams Mark Hotel. As you know, that's complimentary to you as long as you don't want to participate in the food functions. The program functions are open, and I think you get a break on the price for the total package if you want to register for that.

There will be an Administrative Operations Retreat February 20-22 at the beach that will affect some of your administrators. I want to thank you for rescheduling this meeting so that I could attend that retreat. That will be the first one that we've had in nine years.

In the course of going around the campuses I have asked each campus where we were on joining the backbone. We should have the campuses that were covered by the National Science Foundation grant on the backbone by the end of March. The operation at Beaufort is on the verge of completion, as is the one at Lancaster and the one at Walterboro. We ran into problems in Union because those two buildings are historic buildings. We have to worry about the architectural code as it provides for not defacing the property; but I hope that that will be on line. This is going to be a constant uphill battle, this business of getting technology in place on these campuses; but I hope that will be completed certainly by the end of this year. It seems to me that every time I think we have everything up to snuff somebody comes in, usually Harry Cato, and tells me you really don't; you're not quite there yet and you need to do this and that.

The physical plants on most of the campuses are in reasonable shape. We have a couple of problems. One is the old building in Beaufort, the old historic building, which I think probably could be saved. There would be tremendous local support for that building. It's an interesting building; I'm sure most of you have seen it, built in 1852. The other building that I think has a significant problem is the Truluck Gymnasium at Union which needs some tremendous work. At Salkehatchie we have some roof problems; but the physical plant on that campus is better than it has been in about five years.

I'm going to ask David Hunter to talk to you about the performance funding indicators. I must tell you that my own attitude toward the performance funding indicators was that (and I don't mind this being on the record) in something like 25 years we haven't been able to explain to the Legislature what the formula is; and I really look forward to

somebody explaining these performance funding indicators for the rest of my life and yours to the Legislature and to the general public. I don't think there's any lack of acumen on the part of the Legislature that they don't understand these things. In fact, it's probably a tribute to their intelligence that they admit that they don't understand these things. I will turn that over to David.

Also, there seems to be some interest in what was said by Mr. Sheheen. There is a letter that some of you have probably seen. Mr. Sheheen, with his usual political acumen and class has indicated that he is not a candidate for the job since the search, in his view, is tainted, but that he is still available and if they don't give him the job he'll sue them. This certainly is indicative of his, as I say, political acumen. "If you don't hire me, by God I'm going to sue you," one of the more interesting statements ever made by a State official in my lifetime, but one which I'm not surprised at.

B. David Hunter, Director of Adult, Academic & Student Support Services

I'm passing around stuff on the indicators. It is the latest in what obviously is a series of the information about that that comes out of the Commission; that came out last week. What is not in there, or may be not obvious, is that we're running on sort of a parallel course with these indicators. The first year, the year we're coming up for, the next budget year 1997-98, 14 of the 37 are supposed to be put into place. Now, what's running parallel to that is the fact that **CHE has not submitted the work of the sector and task force committees to the Legislature. They've submitted basically what they call policies, regulations, and interpretations,** and stuff like that, but by our standards of what all of the work of last Fall that you all have talked about, none of the weights and benchmarks have been forwarded to the Legislature.

Right now they are looking at the first one, approval of mission statements. I think that's 1c in your book; and I'm not going to go through that because I met with the Executive Committee last Friday and told them what was going on there. We have to get that to our Board, approved by our Board, and to CHE by April 15. All 33 institutions have to do that, so everybody's feeling the heat.

I was on the technical support staff for what they called the Two Year Sector Committee. We really did engage with the business community people that were on that committee. These people rolled up their sleeves and worked with us. If there was a benefit to that it was that they really saw how

awkward it can be getting the Commission to represent our work in its truest light. What we want to do with that is part of one of the other things we live under called Act 629, a master plan for higher education. We want to bring these people back to talk about what was learned in the Sector Committees and help incorporate their new knowledge and expectations as business leaders in the State into the master plan. Are there questions about performance indicators before I talk a little bit about developmental education?

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter): Now you say that the CHE will have received from our Board of Trustees an articulation of the mission statement of the University?

David Hunter: That is an excellent clarifying question. What will be put forward is nine mission statements because each institution is a free standing institution within a sector. We will put forth the University Mission Statement, Aiken, Spartanburg, and each Regional Campus; so there will be nine mission statements sent forth on behalf of the University of South Carolina.

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter): Are these mission statements the ones that have already been worked through the System and pretty much printed?

David Hunter: I think you'll be pleasantly surprised by how closely it follows that. What the indicator says is that this must be an approved mission statement that's going to follow very closely what SACS requires.

Professor Tom Powers (Sumter): I have a question about how we'll have to modify these mission statements. For example, we have to address pertinent description information, e.g., public vs. private, 2 year, 4 year college or University. In your view, is there any way we can avoid having this locked up into that two year box we've been trying to avoid all these years?

David Hunter: I'm choosing not to view that particular item, Tom, as defining if in your sector. Our Sector Committee was very careful to send forward with our weights and benchmarks a clarifying statement that defers to the System Mission Statement that says we are not two year campuses.

Professor Tom Powers: Is it your belief, then, that CHE will let us get away with not saying that we are two year?

David Hunter: I'm going to be optimistic and say I think we can. I don't plan to write "two year" in any of those things.

Professor Carolyn West (Sumter): We had a long, hard fight about it and actually what Fred Sheheen assured us was that we could say what we wanted to and he would support it. Now we'll see.

David Hunter: Developmental education: what we're doing right now. Of course the Sumter and Beaufort campuses will no longer be offering developmental education as defined by English 101, Math 100, and UCAM 120; so they are now formulating plans. There is some movement toward change on the Columbia campus. What Dr. Duffy and I have to do is to work that liason between what we think is sometimes an interesting view that the Commission and people throughout the country have on developmental education vs. what you all know is needed out there and what works. What we're really attempting to do is really change the way we view how we address the needs that students have in these areas. Dr. Duffy and I sort of have different concerns about what changes in developmental education mean. His view is that if we are going to distinguish ourselves from these tech schools that's an important distinction. I share that, but also have a more bureaucratic point of view. The new regulations that apply to developmental ed I'm just very uncomfortable with because they want literally almost a common statewide syllabus for a developmental ed course whether it be taught at York Tech or whatever like that. In my estimation you track a student practically till his or her grave after they've taken that course. It's so much effort defending the offering of developmental education and those students that take it vs. teaching the doggoned students what they need to know and to get them to be successful college students. A lot of those things roll together to where what we're trying to do with developmental education is to really get it to where you all have a lot more freedom in what you're doing with teaching students as you know they need to be taught. So that's what's going on right now. One clarification that has gotten kind of muddied: Sumter and Beaufort are mandated to get rid of developmental education by next Fall. The other three of you by the regulations of CHE are not; but that's an internal decision that's been made that some time in the near future we're no longer going to teach developmental education at the five Regional Campuses. What this means is that Sumter and Beaufort can be a model for you all as they set this up to see what works and what they need to change.

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter): If there is a leaning toward using software packages and computer systems to assist in getting at this quote "developmental content" is there going to be some kind of financial support for developing that on the Regional Campuses? That's an expensive process.

David Hunter: In the case of what Bonnie has done at Fort Jackson, she's used existing stuff she's literally found. Sally, I don't think she's spent anything on it so far, has she?

Professor Sally Boyd: We're talking about a small scale operation; but it's not that expensive.

David Hunter: Robert, you hit on a big point. You have to be creative in how you are replacing what you are doing. There is a cost associated with this. Tom can tell you very painfully that there is a cost.

Professor Tye Johnson (Salkehatchie): If you take the technology approach it may be a place where some of the technology fees we charge students might be appropriately spent.

David Hunter: That's a good point. Anything else? OK, thanks a bunch.

Chair Jerry Dockery (Continuing Education): Before we move into reports from standing committees I'd like once again to request that all voting Senators please get in the middle, nonvoting please get on the sides. We're going to have some critical votes today and I don't want to miscount.

#### IV. Reports from Standing Committees

##### A. Rights and Responsibilities - Professor John Logue

The Rights & Responsibilities Committee discussed two issues today. The first concerned faculty rights and responsibilities relative to the setting of local academic calendars including holidays. This issue was referred to the Committee by the Chair and it relates to an issue on the Sumter Campus concerning celebration of a Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday on that campus. Relative to this issue the **Rights and Responsibilities Committee requests that the Office of the Vice Provost and Executive Dean for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education provide a written summary of the policy which governs the setting of local academic calendars and holidays and that the summary include the procedures by which proposed changes to the calendar or holidays are approved and implemented. We request that the summary be presented to the Chair of this Committee in advance of the next Regional Campuses Faculty Senate meeting.** The feeling about this is that we really needed to know what the policies and regulations were before we could act or make suggestions as to these questions.

The second issue that was discussed was a continuation of an ongoing discussion about the two versions of Qualifications for Rank of Professor and Associate Professor. Since those motions are already entered and are a part of old business, I suppose they will be taken up at that point. Any questions? Thank you.

B. Welfare: Professor Tye Johnson (Salkehatchie)

Currently, Professor Kher is passing out a summary of the variety of methods for determining and the variety of scales for paying faculty in both overload and adjunct roles on our campuses. (Attachment 1). We've submitted this to you as an informational package; we don't present a motion for standardizing this kind of process across the campuses; but we do ask that you take this informational handout, present it to your faculties, and discuss the issues. The Lancaster information was received too late for inclusion. I also want to thank Professor Alvarez at Beaufort for coordinating the gathering of this information.

Secondly, Professor Kher from Sumter is continuing to compile the data on the difference in salary increases between Regional Campuses administrators and faculty. That should be available for a report at the Beaufort meeting.

Also at the last meeting the Committee was assigned the task of gathering information on the variety of peer evaluation forms across the Regional Campuses. A subcommittee has been assigned this task.

Professor Sal Macias (Sumter): Tye, did we verify with Interim Dean Powers Sumter's overload which is not on this form? We discussed that in committee.

Professor Tye Johnson: Not yet. We did notice when we reviewed the Sumter report that their overload pay wasn't specifically addressed.

Dean Powers: What USC Sumter has done is first of all to define Special Faculty in the policy which is in your enclosure. You may call them adjuncts or part-timers; we don't use either term, at least officially. They are Special Faculty and there are many different kinds of Special Faculty: Visiting Faculty, Lecturers; Adjunct Faculty is a very special kind of Special Faculty, and the definition is in here. Most of our Special Faculty don't necessarily meet that status. What is also mentioned here is the present salary scale. The scale does vary according to rank and status of the individual. On the front it says that our adjuncts are paid by individual contract. That is true for

those designated officially "Adjunct." For those who are what you would call part-timers, it depends on what rank of part-timer they are and the pay scale is here per credit hour. Our regular faculty teaching above load receive the same as the highest paid ranked Special Faculty; so right now regular faculty teaching above load would get \$650 per contact hour.

Unidentified speaker: Tom, what is considered a full load for teaching faculty?

Dean Powers: Twelve contact hours.

Professor Tye Johnson: Thank you, that does respond and we'll make sure that is reflected in our information.

We have not made recommendations regarding a pay standard for Regional Campuses vs. Columbia faculty. Relative salaries have varied only about one percent over the past six years.

C. System Affairs: Professor Roy Darby (Beaufort)

A written report was submitted. (Attachment 2)

Professor Jerry Dockery (Chair): With respect to communications, I'd like to call your attention to the minutes. The directions for getting on the USC listserve are in there and it is entertaining if nothing else.

V. Executive Committee: Professor Robert Costello (Sumter)

A report of the February 7, 1997 meeting of the Executive Committee was read into the record. (Attachment 3)

At its morning session today (2/14/97) the Executive Committee discussed the order and strategy for handling old business in the afternoon session.

A letter distributed by Fred Sheheen was reviewed and will now be read into the record and included as an attachment to these minutes. (Attachment 4). This letter is a letter that was sent to Mr. R. Austin Gilbert in Florence, copies to CHE members, college presidents, selected media, and the Governor's Office; and it is dated February 12, 1997

The Secretary notes that Senate directory information remains incomplete (except for Beaufort and Continuing Ed.) and requests that each delegation submit it.

That concludes my report. Are there any questions?

Professor Jerry Dockery (Continuing Education): With respect to the grievance procedure, there's still some confusion over how we got out of the State Grievance Procedure. It was a move on our part to remove ourselves. I'll be continuing in the months and years to follow up on this.

Professor Tandy Willis (Union): Regarding the letter the Secretary read, does anybody in this room have access to the job description for Executive Director? We've been trying to find it; it's not on the CHE homepage.

## VI. Reports from Special Committees

### A. Committee on Libraries: Professor John Catalano (Lancaster)

Our only meeting since the last meeting was cancelled and we have not met this semester.

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

A written report was submitted. (Attachment 5)

Professor Roy Darby (Beaufort): Robert, I continue to be concerned about the dissemination of course additions, deletions, and modifications to the campuses; and it is my recollection that we were going to establish a network of distribution to each campus by the net and I'm wondering is that in place now and is it functioning?

Professor Castleberry: As I indicated in one of the previous meetings, there is that listserve. I don't know if we're having a problem with it from our end at Sumter because it's on our server. I'll be glad to double check into that. I haven't received notification of anyone really subscribing to it yet. Therefore they're not going to be getting anything.

Professor Darby: It was my understanding that there was going to be a contact person on each campus who would be the recipient of - I mean a specific designated person to make sure that information got to the appropriate departments on each of the campuses. Is that correct?

Professor Castleberry: That was my hope, but again, until I have a specific address for someone, I'll be glad to E-mail, or they subscribe, which does the exactly same thing. That mechanism has not worked effectively. It should be able to; it has not as yet.

Professor Darby: Would you give us the listserve address so



it could be reflected in the minutes, or do you have it?

Professor Castleberry: It is in the previous set of minutes.

C. Committee on Faculty Welfare: Professor Roy Darby  
(Beaufort)

There is no report from Faculty Welfare. It has not met since our last meeting. It will meet again February 18.

Chair Jerry Dockery: Professor Darby is going to be leaving that committee and we'll have another nominee at the April meeting. It's a tough committee to be on. I've been on it twice. They do a lot of work. I'd like to thank Roy for his service on it.

D. Faculty-Board of Trustees Liason Committee: Professor Carolyn West (Sumter)

Academic Affairs and Faculty Liason of the Board of Trustees met on December 10 for the purpose of grievances. It also met on February 7 and the items that were considered that I thought might be of interest to you were that two programs were approved for Bachelor's Degrees, one at Aiken and one at Spartanburg. Please remember that actions that take place in this committee still have to be approved by the Board of Trustees itself; so these are just being recommended out. One is a new program at Aiken entitled Bachelor of Arts Degree in Communications. It's basically a journalism and speech communications degree. The second program was Bachelor of Science in Management of Technology at USC Spartanburg. This is a degree in which students that have gained degrees in engineering technology at tech schools will continue on at Spartanburg to get a Bachelor's degree; and most of the courses that they take will be in business.

Other items that were considered were changes in the faculty manual for Columbia; and most of these changes involved wording that had to do with committees. One change was to replace the statement that every committee shall meet at least four times per year with the statement that every committee shall meet at least once per year and whenever new members are elected or appointed. A second change was to delete reference to the committee entitled "Health Professional Undergraduate Advisement Committee." It is my understanding that the Provost has arranged for that committee to be handled in some other way. And there was a change in the wording for the Bookstore Committee.

We also in executive session approved appointments with tenure for individuals, an Associate Professor in the College of Journalism and Mass Communication and a Full

Professor at the College of Engineering. I'd like to point out because there's a controversy on our campus presently, that one of the files was seven pages long and the other file was fifteen pages long. Finally, we heard a grievance. Are there any questions?

Dean John May: Was the degree at Spartanburg like a business degree?

Professor West: Yes, it's entitled Management of Technology but the courses that they take primarily at Spartanburg are business. The ones that they take at the tech school are their core courses plus I think 30 hours in engineering technology.

Professor Jerry Dockery (Continuing Education): What department did the grievance come from?

Professor West: It came from the School of Applied Professional Sciences.

E. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee:  
Professor Steve Bishoff (Sumter)

We have no met.

F. Other Committees

1. Insurance and Annuities: Professor Jerry Dockery

This committee has not met since the last meeting; there is no report.

2. Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness:  
Professor Mary Barton

As some of you are aware, problems regarding the IDEA student evaluation instrument have surfaced. Therefore, the Committee plans to present a motion to withdraw the motion made in November and we are going to ask that the motion be remanded back to Committee so that we can reconsider this. We have more information and materials regarding our other assignments that we need to meet on; and I suspect we are going to try to meet just before the Beaufort meeting.

Chair Jerry Dockery: The Chair accepts the withdrawal of the motion and remands it back to Committee. Thank you,  
Professor Barton.

3. University Committee on Conflict of Interest:  
Professor Tandy Willis (Union)

No conflict of interest has reached that Committee this semester.

Chair Jerry Dockery: I am happy to hear it. Thank you.

VII. Special Orders

none

VIII. Unfinished Business

Chair Jerry Dockery: If you'll look in the minutes (of November 15, 1996), Attachment 1, page 17, Motion II was ruled substantive and was to be voted on at this meeting. It reads "The Committee moves that the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate vote as to **which version of "Qualifications for Academic Rank" be accepted** as the version by which tenure and promotion decisions are made at the regional campuses."

Professor Sal Macias (Sumter): I move we amend the motion whereby Version I will strike the words "research and/or" in both paragraphs, thereby leaving the words "scholarship."

Professor John Catalano (Lancaster): I'd like to second that.

The motion to amend Version I passed after discussion. The floor reopened for discussion of the original motion, as amended.

Professor John Catalano: I'd just like to point out that what Ellen said [not in these minutes as it was ruled out order by the Chair] that the "Teaching Plus Two" would all someone to concentrate on teaching and ignore scholarship completely although Sal agreed with it: I don't believe yo can be an excellent teacher and ignore scholarship. I thin that's what makes a poor teacher, not an excellent teacher

THRU  
P.  
22

Professor John Logue (Sumter): It is conceivable that a person could build a file in which they put evidence relative to student evaluations and other teaching materials in it and evidence relating to community service and things such as that in the file and submit it for application. How you view it would be a different thing; but this regulation would permit that and may lead people to believe that would be acceptable.

Professor Sal Macias: I am going to make an appeal for Version II. While it does change prevailing opinions about the criteria that initially the Regional Campuses emphasized teaching and allowed individual professors to choose among

the others as we thought most appropriate for our calling, systems evolve, standards change, and there is nothing unlikely or inappropriate about that. It is critical, especially at this point in time, that we differentiate ourselves from the technical campuses; and we will do so primarily on the basis of scholarship, not community service or campus service. This is only a practical concern; but it is my opinion that no application for full professor will ever be approved by the Provost or the President if it doesn't emphasize scholarship.

Professor Dockery: Yes, I think that was Professor Catalano's point also.

Professor Logue: Something came up since we have debated this that I think deserves a little review. In looking at the old Columbia Campus' faculty manual relative to their standards for qualification. The old version (1994 version) had no reference to service. They have moved in that direction a little bit. The version that is now on Internet (and I haven't seen a hard copy of this) sort of follows this recommendation that I heard from that committee. The pertinent part in this recommendation (and it's now in the Columbia faculty manual) says "For most faculty members the primary basis for promotion will continue to be documentation of a record of high quality teaching, research, scholarship or creative performance with consideration also given to documentation of a record of valuable service." But lest you celebrate too soon, there is a qualification: "Faculty members who are in positions that are primarily public service oriented should be evaluated with heavy emphasis placed on the quality of performance of the service provided. The faculty member with primarily public service responsibilities should be able to make a case for the quality of the public service and how it relates to research and/or teaching." In other words, that definition of service is included in our scholarship, so we are not eliminating service or any of the other University functions, just that these things should be related to scholarship as it is now defined.

Professor Jerry Dockery: I have a question, John. Do you think the same people who can't read the "and/or" in one sentence can understand that reasoning?

Professor Carolyn West (Sumter): This won't concern most of us in the room; what it will concern is junior faculty and new hires. We have three people retiring on our campus this year; and that means that we may be bringing young faculty in. I have a perspective from sitting on the Board of Trustees that agrees with Professor Macias in that I don't think if anyone goes forward with anything except an

outstanding record in teaching and scholarship that they'll ever get promoted or get tenured. If we adopt Version I and obfuscate the issue and lead a junior faculty member to believe that they will get tenured or promoted if they are outstanding in teaching and two other areas, they are going to fall short of the mark and not get tenure and promotion; and it will be our fault because we didn't clearly state what will be expected of them at Columbia. And Columbia is not just picking us out and trying to change our criteria. They are doing the same thing at Aiken, they are doing it at Spartanburg, and they are doing it in colleges at Columbia. I know that Professor Catalano doesn't care what they think in Columbia; but I think we need to think about what the future of our campuses and the people that we are hiring to fill positions will be if we adopt Version I.

Professor Catalano: It is not that I don't care what they think in Columbia; but I think that the job of this Senate is to pick what is best for our campuses and which fits in best with our mission. I heard since the last meeting that Don Greiner doesn't like our definition of scholarship. If we turn in teaching and scholarship as our sole criteria that definition of scholarship - you watch - will be what Columbia administrators decide scholarship will be. It isn't to me an issue of how it's going to affect me. I'm going to be promoted; it doesn't make any difference one way or the other under either criteria; but what we are picking is the future of our campuses; what they'll look like and how they'll be and what our primary mission will be. If you go along with Carolyn's reasoning and adapt our theories to comply with what we think Columbia might want of us then you are changing your campuses for the wrong reason in my book.

Professor Steve Bishoff (Sumter): To represent the Faculty Organization, there was great concern regardless of which way we work on the term "scholarship." If we pass this and do not require the various administration and fiscal resources that they back up scholarship with monies to make the opportunities for scholarship available, then we've made a requirement that is essentially worthless.

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter): Irrespective of the august thinking ability of our Faculty Organization, I think that I would strongly encourage this group to support Version II. I think that we have already defined what we mean by scholarship. My impression of that definition is that it in fact includes service, it includes professional growth and experience; it includes a lot of components, but only to the extent that we can document its relationship to teaching and the sharing of information. I think that what Version II does is it focuses people's attention to where it best needs to be focused: that to progress for us

collectively as Regional Campuses and for us as individual faculty members we must be concerned with teaching and one strong component of that is scholarship. It also does something I think that has been missing in the past for the Regional Campuses that is obviously much more clearly understood now: the role of documentation. It will be critical under Version II to clearly articulate in our request for promotion and tenure a justification for the assertion that we should be promoted and tenured relating to those things that we already do. So I really think that the second version is more precise; it's cleaner; and it focuses our attention in the appropriate direction.

Chair Jerry Dockery: Has everyone heard enough and ready to vote?

Professor Logue: Just to remind everyone that this only refers to promotion to the two highest academic ranks. It does not relate to tenure. Neither does it relate to promotion to Assistant Professor.

Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): I would like to speak in favor of Version II because of all the things that have already been said in favor of it and also because we are talking about the two highest ranks; and I think we want to project at least the impression that we are raising the bar and not lowering it. Version one I look at and it looks like we're lowering the bar or making it easier.

Professor Jeff Strong (Salkehatchie): I would like to move that we postpone the vote until we have a definition of scholarship agreed upon.

After a second and a brief discussion, the motion was defeated.

Professor Robert Costello (Sumter) Moved to amend the motion to include the provision that it is in effect only if the definition of scholarship we passed in Motion I (in November) is approved by the administration. The motion was seconded.

A request by Professor Carolyn West (Sumter) for a roll call vote did not receive the two thirds majority the Chair asserted that it required to change our normal operating rules.

After considerable discussion, the motion to amend was defeated.

The vote on the motion (Motion II) was as follows: 12 for Version I, 16 for Version II, zero abstentions.

IX. New Business

A. Motion from the System Affairs Committee

Professor Roy Darby (Beaufort) presented the following motion from the System Affairs Committee. The System Affairs Committee moves that the Secretary of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate incorporate the pamphlet, Information for New Senators, into the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate homepage.

Our reasoning here is simply to disseminate information on a broader basis to faculties on the campuses, just one more vessel for home campuses understanding what we do.

Chair Jerry Dockery: Coming from committee, the motion needs no second. Is there any discussion?

Professor Robert Costello (Sumter): I'd like to ask whether we have scanners that will do that. That's a huge volume of material. Do you have it on disc?

Chair Jerry Dockery: It can be on disc or it can be scanned. We've got the technology.

Professor Steve Bishoff (Sumter): The homepage can take virtually any volume, I think; and this particular pamphlet is quite short.

**The motion passed.**

B. Report of the Nominating Committee

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): The Nominating Committee met at lunch today to prepare a slate of candidates for presentation to the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate April meeting in Beaufort. Anyone may make additional nominations to me before the April meeting if you would like to and at that time nominations may also be made from the floor. Here is the slate that was approved by the Nominating Committee today. (See Attachment 6)

X. Announcements

Professor Jerry Dockery, Chair (Continuing Education): Ellen will take over as Chair one meeting early. I've had a presentation accepted for the Southern Sociological Society and will be in New Orleans delivering it. I'd like to thank Ellen, Sal Macias, and Roy Darby for their criticisms. I'm going to change some things before I get to New Orleans.

Professor Robert Costello (Sumter) read the campus report from Dean Les Carpenter, who was unable to attend.

(Attachment 7)

Professor Brad Wagner (Beaufort): Lynn Mulkey wanted me to announce that she and Dean Meeks successfully submitted a grant to the National Endowment for the Humanities called "Low Country Traditions and Transitions, Perspectives on Cultural Change and Preservation." It's going to be in October; and they're going to have a couple of distinguished speakers from Duke and Princeton.

XI. Adjournment

Professor Dockery, Chair, adjourned the meeting.



REGIONAL CAMPUSES PAY STANDARDS  
(for 3 credit hour course)

	Adjunct Faculty	Faculty Overload
Beaufort	See Enclosure 1	\$ 1500.00 (Asst. Prof.) \$ 1599.00 (Assoc. Prof.) \$ 1698.00 (Full Prof.)
Lancaster		Not received
Lifelong Learning	\$ 1400.00	6.25% - 9 month salary 6.25% -12 month configured on a nine month basis
Salkehatchie	\$ 1350.00 (MA) \$ 1750.00 (Terminal Degree)	\$ 1350.00 (MA) \$ 1750.00 (Terminal Degree)
Sumter	By individual contract	See Enclosure 2
Union	\$ 1100.00 (instructors) \$ 1200.00 (MA) \$ 1300.00 (Terminal Degree)	Same as Adjunct plus \$100 for colleagues holding at least an MA.

*Enclosure to CAC Senators  
T, Distribute & Discuss*

# Enclosure I

## RANK AND SALARY INFORMATION:

The USCB faculty has set up the salary and rank schedule, which follows, based on years of service and degree(s) held.

Time Requirement	Rank	Degree	Salary*
First six semesters	Lecturer	MS/MA/MBA/PA	\$1,200
First six semesters	Lecturer	Ph.D./Ed.D. /MA + CPA/JD	\$1,400
After six semesters, the Lecturer may apply to the Academic Dean for promotion. The Academic Dean will review the application and notify the applicant of the results.	Adjunct Assistant Professor	MS/MA/MBA/PA	\$1,400
		Ph.D./Ed.D. /MA + CPA/JD	\$1,600
After a total of twelve semesters, the Adjunct Assistant Professor may apply to the Academic Dean for promotion. The Academic Dean will review the application and notify the applicant of the results.	Adjunct Professor	Ph.D./Ed.D. /MA + CPA/JD	\$1,700

After six semesters of teaching at the highest possible rank, the Adjunct Assistant Professor will receive \$1,700 and the Adjunct Professor will receive \$2,000.

\*Per three hour course.

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS  
 Standing Operating Procedure  
 February 26, 1996

SUBJ: Payment for teaching above-load

No payments for teaching above-load will be made until the faculty member in question actually is teaching above his or her normally assigned load. Thus, an overload which involves any second-half courses (Fall II or Spring II) will not be paid until it is determined that those courses actually will be taught, and that the faculty member is indeed teaching above load.

When a faculty member teaches for more than one division, each division chair should input the courses taught for his/her division. The division chairs should coordinate with each other to determine if the faculty member should receive above load pay. If an above load situation occurs, the home division chair should sign the above load forms.

*Thomas L. Powers*

Thomas L. Powers  
 Interim Associate Dean  
 for Academic Affairs

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

July 17, 1995

SUBJ: Special Faculty Salary Scale

Salaries will be commensurate with rank, according to the schedule published prior to each semester. As of Fall, 1995, the schedule is as follows (per contact hour):

1. Lecturer I (with Master's Degree)	\$475
2. Lecturer II (with Terminal Degree)	\$550
3. Senior Lecturer I (with Master's Degree)	\$550
4. Senior Lecturer II (with Terminal Degree)	\$650
5. Adjunct Faculty	By individual contract
6. Visiting Faculty	By individual contract

Thomas L. Powers  
 Interim Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Enclosure 2



## POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

ORIGINATOR Academic Affairs Number ACAD300  
 SUBJECT Special Faculty Date 7/7/95  
 AUTHORIZED BY Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

**Lecturer:** a temporary full-time or part-time faculty member appointed on a semester-to-semester basis or year-to-year basis, depending on the need for his/her services. No limit is placed on the number of reappointments. Time served as a Lecturer does not count toward permanent or regular faculty status, and Lecturers are not eligible for tenure. A LECTURER I HOLDS A MASTER'S DEGREE OR THE EQUIVALENT. A LECTURER II HOLDS A TERMINAL DEGREE OR THE EQUIVALENT.

**Senior Lecturer:** a temporary full-time or part-time faculty member appointed on a semester-to-semester basis or year-to-year basis, depending on the need for his/her services. No limit is placed on the number of reappointments. When a Lecturer has taught a minimum of fifteen total courses or a minimum of ten courses over a five-year period, he/she becomes eligible for Senior Lecturer status. The Senior Lecturer rank should be recommended by the appropriate Division Chair through the Associate Dean to the Dean of the University. The Dean then reviews degrees, credentials, teaching evaluations, letters from interested faculty, as well as letters from the Division Chair and Associate Dean, and either grants Senior Lecturer status or does not grant such status. Time served as a Senior Lecturer does not count toward permanent or regular faculty status, and Senior Lecturers are not eligible for tenure. A SENIOR LECTURER I HOLDS A MASTER'S DEGREE OR THE EQUIVALENT. A SENIOR LECTURER II HOLDS A TERMINAL DEGREE OR THE EQUIVALENT.

**Adjunct Faculty:** a temporary full-time or part-time faculty member of substantial professional caliber and reputation in his/her professional field. Adjunct Faculty may fulfill special instructional needs of a division in the classroom, studio, laboratory, or field supervision sites. According to circumstances, these faculty usually hold the terminal degree, and may be salaried or serve without a stipend. Time served as a Adjunct Faculty does not count toward permanent or regular faculty status, and Adjunct Faculty are not eligible for tenure. Adjunct Faculty rank (which may be Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, or Adjunct Professor) should be recommended by the appropriate Division Chair through the associate Dean for Academic Affairs to the Dean of the University.

**Visiting Faculty:** a full-time appointment, usually for no more than one or two years, of one who holds academic rank or high professional status elsewhere and is presently on leave of absence from his/her home institution or organization. Time served as a Visiting Faculty does not count toward permanent or regular faculty status, and Visiting Faculty are not eligible for tenure. The actual rank may be Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Professor, as appropriate to the status of the individual.

SPECIAL FACULTY WILL BE PAID ON THE BASIS OF CONTACT HOURS. LECTURERS AND SENIOR LECTURERS WILL BE PAID ACCORDING TO A STANDARD SCALE, WITH SALARY COMMENSURATE WITH RANK. ADJUNCT AND VISITING FACULTY WILL BE PAID BY INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT. UNDER EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MERITS OF A SPECIAL SITUATION AND WITHIN BUDGETARY AND OTHER POLICY CONSTRAINTS, THE ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS IS

Report to the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate  
System Affairs Committee

The System Affairs Committee first addressed the need to provide information to the campuses regarding the duties and responsibilities of faculty senators to their home campuses. It was moved that the information contained in the pamphlet for new senators be included on the home WEBpage of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate. Discussion was held regarding the use of the manual as a "delivery system" for this information.

Senator Castleberry then provided the Committee with a draft of proposed procedures and policies regarding the process through which courses are designed, approved and designated on the Regional Campuses. Senators are to discuss this material with their home campuses and provide input at the April meeting of the RCFS.

The Committee moved for approval of the motion to incorporate the pamphlet material for new senators into the RCFS home page.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Roy Darby".

Roy Darby, chair

Report of the meeting of the RCFS Executive Committee. 2/7/97  
Robert C. Costello, Secretary

The Executive Committee met on Friday, February 7 in the USC Columbia Faculty House.

Vice Chair Ellen Chamberlin (Beaufort) announced that she needs a nominating committee member from each campus to meet during the Lancaster meeting of the Senate. Traditionally, a member of each delegation whose term is expiring is appointed by the campus Executive Committee member.

Professor Tye Johnson (Salkehatchie) reported that the Faculty Welfare Committee is gathering requested data on faculty vs. administration salary increases. A report, not a motion, on the issue of Regional Campuses faculty salaries relative to those of Columbia should be expected from the Committee.

Chair Jerry Dockery (Continuing Education) reported that Provost Greiner had responded somewhat negatively to the definition of scholarship passed at the November 15 meeting of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate. Provost Greiner prefers a more traditional research-oriented definition.

Professor John Logue (Sumter), who will chair Rights and Responsibilities in place of Steve Anderson at the Lancaster meeting on February 14, indicated that the Committee will deal first with the issue of faculty prerogatives to set academic calendars, then with Versions 1 & 2 of criteria for promotion and tenure.

David Hunter, from Dr. Duffy's Office, provided the Executive Committee with a penetrating analysis of the status of developmental courses and performance indicators. He noted that other campuses are looking to Sumter and Beaufort to develop models for dealing with the loss of developmental courses. Among resources he suggested that we consider are "freeware" being collected by Bonnie Kelly, materials that ETS sales reps can show us, and distance ed originating at LOCO Tech. Regarding models, David noted Don Curlovic's proposal to provide developmental math courses at Sumter by having USC Sumter faculty teach Tech courses for Tech on the USC Sumter campus. Many details are under discussion. John Logue (Sumter) noted that Winthrop and Piedmont Tech already have a model in place. David Hunter observed that moving developmental education out of the missions of universities is part of a national trend. One positive result of this for us would be to get out from under the mass of bureaucratic paperwork associated with reporting developmental outcomes.

During a brief recess, Jerry Dockery entertained those in attendance with an account of the early career of a well known entertainer.

David Hunter reviewed progress and work needed on the new

performance indicators. Fourteen of the thirty seven indicators are to be phased in during the first year, applying only to 25% of newly appropriated money. The first of these fourteen involves the mission statements of all 33 institutions, which are to be examined by April 15. A form needs to be filled out using portions of the mission statement. The process is one of editorializing rather than changing mission statements. It was concluded that there is no need for Senate action on this; but it is important for us to understand what is going on. David Hunter and Harry Matthews are USC representatives on the committee that is working on mission statements.

Student evaluations are required by the indicators.

Our friend Fred Sheheen hasn't yet forwarded all the Sector Committee work, just definitions and procedures, not weights. He didn't like our low weighting of research or the fact that Tech threw away 36 of the 37 indicators and chose to focus only on strategic plans. The search for a Fred successor is proceeding. The title is Executive Director. Fred had called himself Commissioner.

Chair Jerry Dockery reiterated his disillusionment with University grievance procedures which he had expressed at the November 15 meeting of this Senate. He recalled that Jimmy Nunnery had concluded that the faculty should have stayed under the State grievance procedures. Dr. Duffy reported similar feelings expressed by USC Columbia's grievance committee chair. Dockery suggested that we should dissolve our own procedure and go back under the State. Also noted was the fact that only our Senate passed the System Grievance procedure, not Columbia or the four-year campuses.

Finally, it was reported that Mary Webb at Beaufort needs by March 15 a list of Senators who will need motel accommodations for April 3, the night before the April 4 meeting of the Senate. Reservations will have to be guaranteed by credit card numbers.



FEB 13 1997

## SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

1333 MAIN STREET

SUITE 200

COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201

February 12, 1997

FRED R. SHEHEEN  
Executive Director

TELEPHONE  
803/737-2260

FAX NUMBER  
803/737-2297

Mr. R. Austin Gilbert  
P. O. Box 3009  
Florence, SC 29501

Dear Mr. Chairman:

It is my understanding from the Office of Human of the Budget and Control Board that applications in the search for Executive Director of the Commission on Higher Education will now close on February 15, 1997.

This letter is to inform you that I will not formally enter the search, for reasons which I will enumerate below. However, I want to emphasize that my decision not to enter the search on a formal basis in no way indicates a disinclination to continue my service indefinitely to the Commission in my current position. In fact, if I am offered the opportunity, I would desire to continue my service.

You may ask then, why have I decided not to enter the formal search, and the reasons are these:

- (1) I have been given information from a member of the General Assembly which indicates, without question, that information presented to the Commission in July regarding the original opening of the search is not accurate.
- (2) While the minutes will indicate that a national search was to be opened and I would be invited to be a competitive candidate, in fact, I have been informed of inquiries and actions by key figures which would compromise the integrity and objectivity of the search process.
- (3) My formal participation in the search process might impair other remedies available to me to preserve my professional and financial integrity.

May I reiterate that it is my desire to continue service to the Commission in my current capacity, and absent the above factors, I would indeed enter the formal search process.

I would welcome an opportunity to discuss these factors with members of the Search Committee and/or the full Commission in an appropriate setting.

Meanwhile, during the coming period, I will continue to meet my responsibilities until the Commission makes an affirmative decision on leadership for the agency.

Sincerely,

Fred R. Sheheen

xc: CHE members: General Assembly; College Presidents; Selected Media; Governor's Office



## **Report on Courses & Curriculum Committee Regional Campuses Faculty Senate: February 14, 1997 Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter)**

I was accused of making a thoughtful and concise report at our last meeting. I will therefore attempt to make this one long and rambling.

The Courses & Curriculum Committee traditionally meets a few hours one Friday each month. However, since the last meeting of this Senate, the Committee has had several extra meetings (we met December 10th, January 10th and 17th, and February 7th and 10th). I might add that they were extra long meetings. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the February 10th meeting.

As always I refer you to the minutes of the Columbia Faculty Senate to determine the specific actions taken on course and curricular changes.

I specifically want to direct your attention to proposed curricular changes in ARTE, BADM, GEOG, MSCI, and THSP. These changes have either already been formally passed or will soon be finalized. Furthermore, there are proposed changes to some 100-level MSCI courses; there are extensive changes to GEOG courses (including some new 200-level courses); and the changes in the BADM program do include changes in courses we routinely offer on the Regional Campuses (in ACCT, ECON, MGSC). This body might need to consider creating some of our own courses to replace those that may be deleted by Columbia in the near future.

Finally, the reason for the Committee meeting so many times was to develop the Maymester program in Columbia. This is the second year of the Maymester -- it is unclear how long this project will continue. I mention this since, if the Maymester does continue, it may be worthy of consideration by the Regional Campuses. More importantly, I think, the Maymester may allow the Regional Campuses (working with the USC Columbia faculty) to offer some very unique courses.

To: Jerry Dockery, Chair  
 From: Ellen Chamberlain, Vice-Chair  
 Date: March 31, 1997  
 Re: Nominating Committee report

The Nominating Committee of the RCFS met on February 14, 1997, and reports the following nominees to the Executive and Special Committees.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Chair: Ellen Chamberlain, Beaufort  
 Vice-Chair: Robert Costello, Sumter  
 Secretary: Mary Barton, Union  
 Member-at-large: Danny Faulkner, Lancaster  
 Member-at-large: Larry West, Salkehatchie  
 Immed.Past Chair: Jerry Dockery, Continuing Ed

SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

Board of Trustees Liaison: Carolyn West, Sumter  
 (1 year term)

Faculty Welfare: Bruce Nims, Lancaster  
 (3 year term begins fall 1997)

NOTE: Additional nominations may be made prior to the April 4 meeting by contacting Vice-Chair Chamberlain. Nominations may also be made from the floor at the April 4 meeting.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 The following Committees are NOT up for consideration at this time:

Conflict of Interest: Tandy Willis, Union  
 (currently completing 1st year of 3-year term)

Curricula and Courses: Robert Castleberry, Sumter  
 (currently completing 2nd year of 3-year term)

Insurance & Annuities: Jerry Dockery, Continuing Education  
 (life-time presidential appointment)

Research & Productive Scholarship: Steve Bishoff, Sumter  
 (currently completing 2nd year of 3-year term)

University Library Committee: John Catalano, Lancaster  
 (currently completing 1st year of 3-year term)

c: Robert Costello, Secretary

Report from the Dean of USC Sumter  
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate Meeting  
February 14, 1997

Since the last meeting of this body, a number of noteworthy events have happened at USC Sumter.

Construction on the Student Union Building has been completed, and the building has been occupied. Included in this newly expanded and renovated building are offices and meeting space for student life administration, student government, the student newspaper, other student clubs and organization, the campus bookstore, the campus hot food services, a student game room, a TV lounge, a commons dining area, an adjoining outdoor patio, a music classroom, and an art instruction studio. Space has been freed up in two other buildings, and significant portions of it will be renovated into classrooms. A grand opening ceremony was held two days ago.

On December 6, 1996, USC Sumter was honored to have Dr. Duffy on campus to speak to the Faculty Organization.

Searches for an Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and an Assistant Dean for Administrative and Financial Services are close to conclusion, with final negotiations underway. Finalists for a tenure-track Assistant Professor of History have been identified and on-campus interviews are being scheduled. Three faculty retirements were recently announced. Professor of Economics Porter Adams will retire May 15 after 30 years at USC Sumter. Professor of English Lee Craig will retire May 15 after 27 years at USC Sumter. Associate Professor of Theater and Speech Ken Callender will retire June 30 after 20 years at USC Sumter. We stand in awe of so many years of dedicated service to the students of our University.

I am pleased to note that two other faculty colleagues, Professors of English Laura Zaidman and Pete Maness, are now back at work following illnesses and surgeries. We pray for their continued recovery to good health.

All of us at Sumter were pleased to note that Professor of Biology Charlie Denny was recently appointed to a four-year term representing all of the regional campuses on the Board of Directors of the USC Educational Foundation. He will replace USC Salkehatchie's Dr. Bette Levine when her term expires on June 30.

Respectfully submitted,

Les Carpenter  
Dean of the University  
USC Sumter