

REPORT OF THE VICE PROVOST & EXECUTIVE DEAN  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES & CONTINUING EDUCATION  
John J. Duffy  
TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE  
April 4, 1997

- Salary at this point is 2.5% with no cap, effective July 1, 1997
- Bond bill passed second reading on April 2
- Debate on the Palmetto Scholarship
- BAIS Status
- New phone system at Union will be operating at Noon on May 15. The T1 has been ordered and should be here by April 21 with an anticipated date for backbone connectivity of mid-June.
- Strategic Plan Meetings are: Beaufort - April 8 at 2:00 pm  
Sumter - April 8 at 3:00 pm  
Union - April 8 at 4:00 pm  
Lancaster - April 18 at 11:00 am  
Salk - April 21 at 4:00 pm  
RCCE - April 22 at 2:00 pm

***DIVISION OF BUSINESS AND FINANCE***

---

**BUDGET ALERT.**

To: Chancellor Robert Alexander, USC Aiken  
Chancellor John Stockwell, USC Spartanburg  
Dean Chris Plyler, USC Beaufort Dean Joseph  
Pappin, USC Lancaster Dean Carl Clayton, USC  
Salkehatchie Dean Leslie Carpenter, USC  
Sumter Dean James Edwards, USC Union

From: Sue Hooks

Date: March 19, 1997

Subject: Ways and Means Recommendation for Bond Bill

The House Ways and Means Committee completed its deliberations on the Bond Bill this afternoon. The bill was reported out favorably as a Committee bill. Representative Boan recommended an amendment that made changes to the regional campus project authorizations. The following changes were made to the Joint Bond Review Committee recommendation:

USC Lancaster Library <b>Repairs-project</b> deleted	(425,000)
USC Lancaster Library <b>Expansion-project</b> reduced	(500,000)
USC Beaufort Beaufort College-project increase	225,000
USC Salkehatchie <b>Reroofing-project</b> increase	200,000
USC Sumter Deferred Maintenance-project increase	200,000
USC Union Maintenance-new project	300,000

The attached is a side-by-side comparison of the Governor, the Joint Bond Review Committee and the Ways and Means Committee recommendations for each project authorization. The bill now moves on to the House for further debate.

cc: Lyles Glenn  
John Duffy  
John Finan  
Johnny Gregory  
Shirley Mills  
Campus Business Officers

1997 BOND BILL RECOMMENDATIONS

AGENCY/PROJECT	Governor Recommend	JBRC Recommend	W&MC Recommend
<b>NEW CONSTRUCTION</b>			
1 USC Cola-Graduate Science Research Center	4,384,066	4,384,065	4,384,065
2 Clemson-Central Energy	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
3 Paldmont Tech.Ed/Student Snrs/Admin Bldg.	3,582,500	4,750,000	4,760,000
4 College of Charleston-New Library	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
5 Lander-Science Hal Renovate and Equip	750,000	3,325,000	3,325,000
6 USC Spart.-Hedge Center Renovation	1,987,600	1,987,500	1,987,500
7 Chest. Marl. Tech-Instructional Library	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
8 Winthrop-Sciences/Math Bldg.	6,750,000	6,750,000	6,750,000
9 SC State-Business School	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
10 Coastal-Humenities Bldg.	11,775,000	11,775,000	11,775,000
11 USC Aiken-New Nursing Bldg.	1,500,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
12 Citadel-Thompson Hall	6,282,000	6,282,000	6,282,000
13 Lowcountry Tech-Health Science Bldg.	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
14 Francis Marion-Energy Facility Upgrade	875,250	875,250	875,250
15 SC State-Fine Arts Bldg.	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,500,000
18 York Tech-Arts/Sciences Bldg.	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
17 Midlands Tech-Airport-Classroom Bldg.	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
18 SC State-AME Sciences Bldg	500,000	500,000	0
19 SC State-Camp Daniel Renovation	600,000	600,000	600,000
20 Florence Darlington Tech	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
21 USC Aiken-Sciencea Building	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
22 Horny-George Tech-Conway-Library/Supp Svcs.	0	3,250,000	3,250,000
23 Horny-George Tech-Georgetown-Redesign	0	750,000	750,000
24 USC Lancaster-IJbrary Expansion	0	4,500,000	4,000,000
25 Trident Tech-Pakner Campus Renovation	0	3,100,000	3,100,000
Subtotal, Now Construction	88,616,315	103,978,816	103,679,816
<b>DEFERRED MAINTENANCE</b>			
26 USC Lancaster-Library Repairs	425,000	425,000	0
27 MUSC-Building Watertightness	8,752,086	8,752,086	8,752,086
28 USC Sch of Med-Reroofing	360,000	350,000	350,000
29 USC 8alkehatchle-ReroofIn0	335,000	336,000	535,000
30 SC State-Steam Distribution System	875,000	875,000	875,000
31 Technical Colleges-Deferred MalntEquip	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
32 USC Beaufort-Seafoor College Bldg Renovate	869,800	859,500	1,084,500
33 USC Cola-Historic Colleges Renovation	14,600,000	14,600,000	14,500,000
34 Greenville Tech-Eng/Technology Bldg Renovatlo	0	5,225,000	5,225,000
36 USC Sumter-Deferred Maintenance	0	200,000	400,000
36 USC Union - Maintenance	0	0	300,000
Subtotal, Deferred Maintenance	36,096,686	41,521,586	42,021,686
<b>OTHER STATE AGENCIES</b>			
36 Dept. of Corrections Faditse	74,700,000	54,700,000	54,700,000
37 School Math & Science-New Bldg Final 2 Phases	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
38 DNR-Environmental Preservation (Jocassee Gorge	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
39 Emergency Prop Division-Relocation	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
40 Clemson PSA-Greenhouse/Agriculture Complex	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
41 DJJ-Central Bldg Center	1,180,000	1,180,000	1,180,000
42 DJJ-Evaluation Centers Modifications	0	0	0
43 DJJ-Greenwood Center Renovation Completion	476,000	475,000	476,000
44 DJJ-New Marine Institute Bldgs.	500,000	500,000	500,000
45 DJJ-Emergency Power Generators	750,000	750,000	750,000
46 DJJ-Prison Industries Bldg.	325,000	325,000	325,000
47 EN-Technology Bldg. Payment	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
48 Dept. of Commerce-Airport Improvements	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Other Agencies	126,160,000	106,160,000	105,160,000
Grand Total, All Agencies	5249,872,901	5260,680,401	6260,660,401
Total USC Projects	26,841,066	31,561,066	31,241,065

**REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**April, 4 1997**

**USC Beaufort**

**Morning session**

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort), Vice Chair, called the meeting to order and noted that she was filling in for Chair Jerry Dockery (Continuing Education) who was recognized for his service to the Senate at the previous week's Executive Committee meeting. She then yielded the floor to Chris Plyler, Dean of the University, USC Beaufort.

Dean Plyler welcomed the Senate to the Beaufort campus, noting renovations underway on campus and in the city of Beaufort. He also noted the presence of Miss Valerie Currie, a USC Beaufort alumna and member of the Beaufort-Jasper County Commission on Higher Education. He also cited the recent election of Walter Conte, former Chairman of the Penn State Board of Trustees to the local commission. The Penn State regional campuses recently attained four-year status effective next Fall.

Dean Plyler: Dr. Ed Seim was going to be with us this morning. Ed is a long time Beaufort Countian who retired here after many years with Westinghouse Corporation. He has been a good friend of this campus for many years. He has taught for us on an adjunct basis; he has taught at Salkehatchie. He is very interested in the affairs of the Regional Campuses; and we are glad that he is interested in what's going on at USC Beaufort. Ed also has taken on many civic responsibilities. He chairs a number of committees locally. He is one of the most involved citizens I've ever been associated with, and he has served on our Foundation Board. He has served on a number of search committees in Business here; he was on the Dean's search committee. He continues to be a major participant in all that we do, and most recently he chaired the Sector Committee for the Regional Campuses in the performance based funding scenario that we're all not too familiar with. He was going to bring us up to date on performance based funding and the activities to this point. However, his wife experienced some medical problems and he needed to be in Charleston this morning. He told me late yesterday evening that I had to give your that update.

Representing the Regional Campuses we had Deborah Cureton from Lancaster, Carl Clayton from Salkehatchie, Carolyn West from Sumter, and myself. I know that Les Carpenter and Jim Edwards were there for virtually every meeting and I felt that throughout the sector proceedings we labored for about eight weeks, and in good faith I might add. We pulled and tugged and struggled and compromised; and Ed, with his strong belief in performance based accountability or measurement, kept us in line, so to speak. We wanted to do at times what the comprehensive research

institutions did and pick about three of those indicators and weight them accordingly. But we went through every one, debated every one thoroughly, and at least as well as we could with the "Commissioner" or the Executive Director and the Associate Executive Director in every one of our meetings observing; so it was an interesting process for me. Unfortunately, **it looks as though all of that has been thrown out to this point.**

What I hoped we could do this morning is just talk about it for a few minutes if this is the appropriate time. I can't begin to explain every detail that has transpired so far but I can, based on some of the facts that I have received, try to interpret and read to you what some of this may mean. I've got a handout that we received last week (Attachment 1) that summarizes the process. Look at those as a basis for discussion this morning.

You will recall that this performance based funding was born in the Legislature in 1996 out of Act 359. What was legislated in the act was to give the CHE a stronger role in reviewing the missions of the 33 public institutions throughout the State, and that alone sent chills throughout the State, I'm sure. In Dr. Seim's opinion and in most everyone that I've come in contact with, 37 indicators are far too many. It probably needed to be condensed into 5 or 6 at most; and we had that discussion early in trying to define what it was we were going to do. At any rate, effective next fiscal year, next academic year, 14 of the indicators will be implemented, and in 1998-99 26, and in 1999-2000 all 37 with 100% of our funding to be based on our performance relative to these indicators is quite scary. Those 14 for next year include mission focus, quality of faculty, instructional quality, administrative efficiency, entrance requirements, graduates' achievements, user-friendliness of the institution, and research funding.

The overall funding plan is referred to now as the "Resource Allocation Plan" or the RAP which takes our base budget figures and applies performance ratings to those figures. The base budget figures are the starting point for the application of the performance ratings and they are derived from a brand new methodology that was passed last week by the Steering Committee as I understand it; and this methodology is known as the "Mission Resource Requirement Model." This model is critically important next year since it is going to replace the old formula as we knew it. It is going to replace the old formula which I still don't understand - but maybe some of you do - and we can make comparisons. This gets awfully detailed and I'm not going to read it all to you, but I do want to point out as Jim Kirk has done from Columbia some of the concerns they have with relation to the Regional Campuses.

The Steering Committee for performance funding voted last week to use the student/faculty ratio for now but to consider other

options for computing faculty requirements later. The problem with the Regional Campus computation as I've heard it as he communicates it to me and to us is that the national peer group selected for comparison is unknown. Currently their plan was to use the same institutions that group all two year colleges and most notably the same group used for the technical colleges. Obviously I think you get different comparisons if you use that peer group.

Let me just say that Dr. Seim wanted me to communicate this one fact. He is disturbed - and I use that word, that's not the word he used - he is incensed that all of the time that we put into the benchmarking and the weighting has literally been thrown out the window. It's not going to be used for anything more than a guiding principle for the Commission staff when they determine how well we're doing. It's going to be totally subjective. I guess you could say, then that our worst fears with concern to this process have been realized, at least to the point it is now. We hear that all institutions will be benchmarked the same and the weights may even be the same throughout all 33 institutions. I don't know how they're going to do that; and he cannot conceive of how they're going to do it, and mentioned to me that he has voiced both verbally and in writing his objections to the Chairman, Mr. Gilbert, obviously to Fred Sheheen, and to Senator Setzler, and to the Beaufort-Jasper legislative delegation. I think he's going to carry it even further. For so much time and effort and negotiation to have taken place and at this point to have it discounted is quite objectionable to him. So that, in a nutshell, is what he would have said this morning. If we want to get into the fine tuning of this thing we certainly have something to read, which I'd rather not do. Rather, as we get it I know your Deans will distribute the formula when it's fully constituted to you for information. Carol Garrison, Kay Coleman, and others from an institutional perspective are monitoring this closely. The institutional vice presidents for business and finance are monitoring it closely; they have a major part to play in it. I don't know what else to say at this point other than it's time to wait and see. I also hear that by May 1 the institutions are going to be asked to provide their own weightings for the benchmarks for all 37 indicators. Again, once we go through all of that as an institution we would submit it to the Commission for approval, so again a subjective yes or no on how well we've done, and after all that has taken place, after we have received the results on how well we did, let's just say on the 14 indicators after next year, then we will be rated on a scale of 1-5 (with a 6 for being exemplary). It's kind of like our EPMS evaluation. You can never achieve the #6; you're probably not likely to achieve as an institution #5. The way I read it the best we can hope for is about 750 of what we're getting today; and I find that to be quite scary.

Associate Vice Provost John May (Continuing Education): Chris, do

the institutions at this evaluation stage have a chance to evaluate themselves and send that forward to the Commission to look at or is the Commission going to evaluate us?

Dean Plyler: Well, yes. I think by determining the benchmarks of course when we look at how the funding mechanism rates, how it stacks up, we're going to benchmark and weight accordingly. Obviously we would want to weight it to achieve - if we look at our institutional history to know what we can achieve and weight it accordingly. Now whether or not that's objectionable by the Commission - I'm sure it will be. This has not worked in other states; they've thrown it out or it hasn't been successful. I don't know what to tell you. Representative Bowers is with us as one of our Senators and maybe we can ask him that question this afternoon. I asked the question of Ed Seim why if there was such an objection from the Legislature ... about the way the comprehensive research institutions went through this process, why weren't they just singled out and made to go back to the drawing board instead of penalizing all of us. I think we represent about 3% of the total higher education budget. The big change is with the larger campuses. He didn't have an answer for that, but they are in the process now of finding the peer institutions against which we will be measured and all of the E & G (educations & general) components used in this new formula. Just based on my brief discussion with Dr. Seim and again what I've read, that's all I can tell you about at this time. There are others in here who have been staying abreast and you might have more to add than I have been able to give you thus far.

Dean Les Carpenter (Sumter): Up till this point the President of this University has expressed unreserved optimism and support for this plan. Does he still express that same level of support for this plan now?

Dean Plyler: Les, I'm hearing what you're hearing and the only objection I've seen from the Columbia Campus is the way the Regional Campuses stack up against the formula and there is concern there. I understand (and I haven't read this article) that there is an article in this week's Chronicle and I don't know if anyone's read that who wanted to report what that had to say. I'd be happy to give you the podium because I haven't read it ... I can't answer that question. I would hope that there is great concern.

Vice Provost John Duffy: There is concern about a combination of factors ... Yes, we are very concerned about it and trying essentially to deal with the peer institutions question. For example, ... under the current proposed formula, only Beaufort would gain and to the tune of about 1.6%.

Dean Plyler: And that's not really a gain, that's an artificial gain because in the appropriations there's about a \$250 million

discrepancy there from '96 to '98-99, so actually it's a loss just like the other Regional Campuses realized; and those were significant losses.

Dr. Duffy: We spent 25 years trying to understand the old formula and I look forward to trying to understand the new formula.

Dean Plyler: I think that it was interesting that at the beginning of the process when Dr. Seim who, by the way, finished MIT and received his doctorate in business management from USC and is a number cruncher, proposed a formula which we couldn't understand at the time. But after further analysis there was some agreement with the way he put together this new formula; and I have not seen that. He was wondering what happened. He was hopeful that some of that might have been introduced into this formula, but to date that has not happened.

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): Would you repeat again about the peer institutions? Is it what you said that the peer institutions for the Regional Campuses will be the same as they are for the technical colleges?

Dean Plyler: Let me quote from Kirk's facsimile to me. "We believe one factor that is causing the problem with the Regional Campus computation is the national peer group selected for comparison." The national amounts per student in the schedule he uses as an example is based on a grouping of two year colleges, the same group used for the technical colleges and, I assume, all community colleges.

Professor Chamberlain: How could that happen when we were put in a separate category to begin with? How did we get lumped back in with the technical colleges?

Dean Plyler: How did they come to the decision they weren't going to use eight weeks of work that we did? I don't know, Ellen. I mean, again totally subjectively, we're back to where we started in my opinion and I can't answer that. But he indicates that they are pressing on this, that we have got to be compared against peer institutions; and there are institutions we can be compared with in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin and other states, maybe Ohio.

Professor Steve Bishoff (Sumter): Did you say that if we were funded the way you understand it now we would get 75% of our current funding?

Dean Plyler: Roughly, based on the ratings after all the numbers come in from next year and the new formula is implemented against what we've done, and then after all of that someone sits up there and decides whether we've been exemplary, which means the performance substantially exceeds institutional and sector benchmarks and represents extraordinary effort. I'm sure



Commissioner Sheheen will give Beaufort a "6," so I'm not worried. [A review of the meaning of each numerical rating was given, but is not included in these minutes].

And again, all of this other that is going on with the Commission and potential restructuring over there, who knows? I don't know what more we can say at this point.

Professor Chamberlain: Chris, is the Commission staff going to prepare these reports and then give them to the full Commission as is usually the case? When we turn in our information then the staff will evaluate us, put the numbers in, and give it to the full Commission?

Dean Plyler: I hope that the full Commission will not defer to the staff and give them that authority to just rate, but I find it difficult to believe that the Commission will be considering each institution. Perhaps in some report that they receive two days before the meeting they'll get some information. We hope that that happens so that we can, in an audience before the full Commission, appeal or give more information. I don't know, Ellen. That hasn't been defined. We've just got the model outlined to this point.

Professor Bishoff: The per capita expenditure on the technical side isn't that radically different from our own. Are they an ally at this point?

Dean Plyler: Well, isn't it more than just that? That is the total education and general budgets compared ... I would assume so. I don't know how the comparisons break down: instructional support and instruction versus salaries to faculty. I am sure there is quite a variance there. Teaching load could hurt us when compared against them since they are trying to cram so many courses into a given semester. My guess is that they would be penalized as well, but I still don't believe we want to be compared with them.

Dean Jim Edwards (Union): Chris, I don't think you know the answer to this either, but it's a question I keep asking myself. Who is the "they?" Is it the Commission support staff, is it the Setzler Committee, is it the staff of the Setzler Committee, or who is it that is throwing it out?

Dean Plyler: Let me give you the players. Who are the key actors in the development of this funding plan and what has been the process to date in developing it? Let me just read this to you. Of course the General Assembly, and Ed Seim says to tell you you can be sure they want performance based funding; there is no question about that. That is going to happen. They, the General Assembly, passed the law in May of 1996. they will approve the regulations promulgated by the Commission on Higher Education and

provide oversight of the implementation of the law by the CHE. So, what CHE passes on they will promulgate. The Commission on Higher Education's responsibilities include approval of the final performance funding plan. They approve the mission statements of the institutions which are used as the basis for evaluating performance; and they will approve the institutional benchmarks for the performance measures. We know all of that. The Steering Committee which is CHE's planning and assessment committee makes the recommendation of the final plan to the CHE, and that is Sally Horner's. Sally Horner chairs the Steering Committee over at Coastal. The Task Forces recommend definitions and measurements for the performance measures by the various subject areas; and their work was completed earlier and those were adopted by the Commission. The Sector Committees which your institutional representatives served on recommended benchmarks and weights for the measures for each of the four sectors; the four sectors being technical colleges, Regional Campuses, senior institutions, and comprehensive. Our work was completed but **the reports were not approved by the Steering Committee of the CHE** because they were not satisfied with the methodology or with the results from the comprehensive institutions. MGT of America, Inc. is the consulting firm hired by CHE to advise on the development of the performance funding plan. The Higher Education Funding Advisory Committee is comprised of vice Presidents of Business and Finance from institutions and legislative representatives and they make recommendations on funding methodology to the Steering Committee. And then there is the Statewide Planning Committee. They develop consistency among the measures to be used among the four sectors.

Dr. Duffy: I thought the Soviet Union collapsed in 1987.

Numerous individuals: laughter

Dean Plyler: I can see a lot of people getting frustrated by this process by 1999, and hopefully you're right, but ...

Dean Edwards: The reason I asked the question was because I understand, but I have no idea whether this is accurate, that there are staff members of legislators who are indeed rewriting it; and as far as I know they've been to school but that's probably their only experience in higher education. So I'm wondering who are the ones that are possibly doing this?

Dean Plyler: Well, you can see the possibility of a scenario developing because you're not performing against whatever measurement, whatever standard, whatever benchmark, whatever weight, how slowly you can watch the demise of any institution, particularly those that aren't politically and adequately buffered, protected. And so that's the worst case scenario; and I'm sorry. I apologize that I'm not a little more fluent in trying to translate this for you, but quite frankly it's been

very difficult for me to understand and for others who are supposed experts in this to understand.

Dean Les Carpenter (Sumter): Chris, if I might comment on what you just read: that the reports the four separate entities who are not accepted or endorsed by the Steering Committee or the CHE. You cited in what you read because of their dissatisfaction with the reports from the three major research institutions in the sector.

Dean Plyler: Yes, that came. back as a result of the Steering Committee meeting and that was just a verbal discussion; so that's not written down here.

Dean Carpenter: So if I understand what you said correctly, my interpretation of your interpretation is because of their dissatisfaction with a single, perhaps three sectors, they did not accept any of the sector reports.

Dean Plyler: Correct, and tossed them all. Now, that could have been an excuse. Who knows what the reasoning is? Again, the subjectivity of this whole process makes me very nervous, and that's the bottom line. That's what we need to be concerned with.

Professor Carolyn West (Sumter): Have you heard anything about progress in filling the Executive Director position in the CHE?

Dean Plyler: I've heard that they've gotten it down to ten finalists and I just read that in the paper last week.

Professor Steve Bishoff (Sumter): Are you suggesting we do, and out of curiosity what are we paying for this CHE thing ... what was the name of this firm?

Dean Plyler: MGT of America, Incorporated.

Professor Bishoff: Is that supported by State funds?

Dean Plyler: Well, the Commission was paying. I don't know what amount they were paid to come in and do this, Steve. You know, I've also heard that before any of the new money is allocated for how well we did in our performance, 5% - or is it \$5 million? - is taken off the top by the Commission. So I don't know if that is for their operating budget as a Commission or what, or if they use that money to reappropriate back to the institutions. I'd kind of find that hard to believe. I don't know what they're paying them. That's a good question.

Professor Bishoff: What do you suggest we do?

Dean Plyler: Well, I would stay in close touch with my legislative delegation. We are dependent on this thing being

monitored by Carol Garrison, who is a good friend of these Regional Campuses, Dr. Duffy's Office, David Hunter is there, Jim Kirk is there. We all need to be there at critical meetings. Ed Seim is there and has committed to me that he is going to dog this thing all the way through. He's got so much time invested in it and quite frankly is very upset that this thing has turned the way it has. The Council of Presidents are upset. I just think we've got to stay in touch with each committee meeting and report back to our own legislative delegations and have them knocking on Senator Setzler's door any time there's something objectionable that's going to affect us in some negative way. The one inspiring thing to me in the Sector Committee is there was a lot of give and take. I mean what's good for Sumter is not always good for Beaufort. What we do well in some areas may not happen in Lancaster the same way. There was healthy give and take and we did it in good faith and I was for the most part pleased with the final results: the weighting and of course the benchmarking. That gave us some strength and Sheheen himself admitted to Ed Seim that we had the most harmonious group. We were orchestrated very well under Ed Seim's leadership and we had Gen. Olsen from Sumter who is on the Commission itself working with us; and so we've got some strong allies who have been through all of this and whose ears are attuned to our needs. But we can't just assume that it's going to end up as something favorable for all 37 indicators for us. So we've just got to keep our voices strong and ears to the track, and that's awfully vague, but that's all I know to do. Again, I'm comforted somewhat that we've got an Olsen and we've got a Seim and we've got representatives from our University who are there and listening. Now we all know that sometimes the Regional Campus issues might be quite different from the Columbia issues, and that we need to pay closer attention.

Professor Bob Costello (Sumter): In the context of the discussion of the public relations image of the University our friend Billy Boan at the February meeting of our Senate said the following

[quoted from 2/14/97 minutes, p.4]. "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." That is not in my opinion really mincing words about what is going on here; and that would confirm that we really do have to worry about it.

Dean Plyler: I think that applies to us and to the tech schools mostly. It sure does.

Professor Chamberlain: Thank you, Dean Plyler.

[At the invitation of the Chair, Campus Deans or their designated representatives presented campus updates at his point in the proceedings].

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort), Vice Chair: I have a report from the Nominating Committee that I would like to read. We will vote this afternoon on the slate of officers for next year and at that time the Chair will entertain any additional nominations from the floor. So until that point be thinking about the slate that I am going to read to you now and see if you would like to add to that.

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
Immediate Past Chair:	Jerry Dockery, Continuing Education
Board of Trustees	
Faculty Liason:	Carolyn West, Sumter
Faculty Welfare:	Bruce Nims, Lancaster

Professor Robert Costello (Sumter), Secretary: That report is in writing in the previous minutes [Attachment 6, p. 34 of the minutes of the February 14, 1997 meeting].

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): I have three additional charges that I would like to give to two Standing Committees before we break out. In your standing committee meetings will you please elect a Chair for next Fall so that we will have that name.

The additional charges were items that came up in the Executive Committee meeting last week.

to Rights and Responsibilities: to formally address the grievance and appeal process in the Faculty Manual as it is presently stated and to recommend revisions as appropriate

to System Affairs: to receive the report from the Beaufort Campus faculty regarding representatives participating in Columbia Faculty Senate meetings via Distance Ed long distance connections, laptop computers, etc.

and also to the System Affairs Committee: the question of creating an official position of webmaster for the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate. We have a homepage that was created this year and now the question is should we, do we need a webmaster to maintain and run that homepage? And, because that is a new position, that will go to the Committee to determine.

New Senators may pick up handbooks up front.

## Afternoon session

### I. Call to order

Professor Chamberlain called the meeting to order.

### II. Correction and Approval of Minutes: February 14, 1997 USC Lancaster

### III. Reports from University Officers

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

A printed outline and additional data were submitted  
(Attachment 2)

Dr. Duffy: Let me bring you up to date on a couple of things some of you already know.

The salary raise in the House version of the Budget is 2.5% effective July 1 with no cap. There was originally a 2.5% raise effective in October with a \$1000 cap on it. That's been removed.

The bond bill which some of the campuses are interested in, in fact all five now, had its third and final reading this week and the campuses will get anywhere from \$200,000 to \$6.3 million with Lancaster getting the lion's share of it.

You may have noticed the debate on the Palmetto Scholarship. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction with the way it was administered. They are very unhappy that for example there was a kid from Lexington High School with a 1600 SAT and a 4.0 GPA who was not accepted; and the particular school he is in happens to be in the district of the Chair of the Senate Education Committee; so he took a very great interest in it. There is one problem for the University and for the Public Sector in that; and that is in all probability this will give the privates an opportunity to go after a higher percentage of that. Currently there is a pot of money that goes completely to the privates, and there is a second pot of money 82% of which goes to the publics, and the privates are anxious to increase their share of it.

The Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies degree: We at the request of the Commission staff have deferred that until October. As far as we're concerned they can defer it forever and a day because we can of course offer the degree until such time as they act on it. In fact, I have encouraged the Deans to try to publicize the degree more and to get heavy enrollments. About 159 students per year throughout the Regional Campuses are enrolled in that, about

59 graduate a year, the majority being female; so it's well worth doing. It saves the State a lot of money.

We are still proceeding to tie the Campuses to the backbone; this has been a little bit slower at some campuses in coming than I anticipated; but Union will be tied to the backbone I understand by the middle of June; and the rest of you should be tied to the backbone. We ran into some serious problems at Union because of historic buildings.

The Strategic Plans: Each campus has a strategic plan as does every College and Department in Columbia. These will be discussed with the Provost through the month of April. The Campuses will be discussed earlier on - most of them - Lancaster and Salkehatchie holding up the rear on that. This will be our first opportunity to make any kind of presentation to the new Provost.

This morning there was some discussion of the possibility that the new formula might negatively impact the campuses. That is accurate. Currently the University business officers and the instructional research people are working to relieve us from some of the problems that we might have.

Also, let me add that I met the Associate Deans on an interesting problem, that is the question of review of faculty. We are trying to get this done in a timely manner. We are trying to get it done face to face with faculty, trying to get faculty signals on it. When we achieve this it will be a miracle, but, after all, I did live through retrospective conversion. They finally got that; so anyway, hopefully we will have that in place.

Another rather interesting problem is where is the official file. We don't know. It's supposed to be in Personnel, but we doubt it. So, consequently, we are going to try to deal with that problem too.

That's it. Any questions?

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter): In the past Sumter had created what amounted to a Martin Luther King no class day. Your verbiage on that in response said that really that had to have approval.

Dr. Duffy: From the President

Professor Castleberry: What authority does the Faculty Organization have? Must everything it does get approval and by whom? Is there some kind of written policy and procedure on that?

Dr. Duffy: Mary, you've been researching that for me.

Mary Macdonald (Office of the Vice Provost): The only real answer I have at this time is that if it is not specifically delegated to the faculty then the authority lies with the President. I attempted to look at the bylaws of the Board of Trustees and basically I can't find any specific policy that assigns responsibilities on that to the faculty organization.

Dr. Duffy: Historically, the calendar has been set by the Registrar and approved by the President's Office. In the record we can find times when the Faculty acted to create certain days, for example by Faculty action we created the so-called Reading Day. The problem with the Martin Luther

King holiday is that it compromised the President who is basically trying to hold on to the way we handle it in Columbia as opposed to the way it's handled elsewhere. He is particularly interested in the fact that it had never gone to him for approval. The best answer is the President. I guess the upshot of this is that we've asked enough questions I'm reasonably sure there will be a policy at some future point.

Professor Castleberry: If it is not specifically specified, for example in the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual or in some other official document, then whatever review priority exists is not at that level but at the level of the .President.

Dr. Duffy: The President. And the other thing is that you get from Personnel each year a list of holidays approved by the State, and we have a peculiar situation. We take some different holidays from what the State does, so that's the reason for that. The Registrar's office is frankly only interested in whether we adhere to the regulations for the . number of class hours, that kind of thing. They really don't care when we do it as long as we do it. We also are aware of the fact, and this is going to require some work too, that the Board of Trustees decided recently at the behest of the President that we try to do all the graduations in one week; so that's going to impact on us in some ways.

The other thing is that historically the University staggered registrations because at that time the equipment was incapable of handling it. That is no longer the case. We could conceivably register all at the same time. But anyway, that's the best answer I can give you this afternoon, and we have done a lot of research on it. As Mary said, we have probably created the opportunity for a policy.

Professor Steve Bishoff (Sumter): Since you mentioned that



one week graduation frenzy, is that going to take place this year?

Dr. Duffy: No, and in fact it's over a two week period with a period of five or six days between the first one and the second one, but it's already set for this year. As to having these things before finals, that's happened in the past. That's not anything new. The earliest graduation has often come before the finals; and we understand that causes some problems. We also now realize that we have some problems in terms of having a graduation in a building when classes are going on, that kind of thing. So we'll try to solve it.

I have one announcement and this has to do with my job in Columbia as Dean of the College of Applied Professional Sciences. A multimillion dollar grant to that College will be announced very shortly.

#### IV. Reports from Standing Committees

##### A. Rights and Responsibilities - Professor Stephen Anderson

We had one new piece of business come before the Committee from the Executive luncheon last week regarding the grievance procedure and the wording in one of the paragraphs that seemed to not have a timeline associated with it. After discussion at the Executive Committee and discussion at the meeting this morning it was quite evident that based on the documents that we passed last September dated June of '96 that some of the things that are in writing are clearly inaccurate, so a motion will be forthcoming under new business dealing with the grievance and appeals procedure. I'll fill you in at that time.

The only other business that we did take care of was that John Logue was elected Chair for next year.

##### B. Welfare: Professor Tye Johnson (Salkehatchie)

Our Committee discussed the peer review data that we are still gathering from the Campuses. In our discussion it really seems to be uneven with respect to the process of peer review. Some campuses have no official peer review document. Campuses are working on them, campuses are adopting them as we speak, but we don't have any to present to you.

On the other charge that we were working on with respect to comparing faculty salary increases to administrative salary increases, Professor Kher reports that the data that would allow these comparisons to be made is not as readily

available as we had hoped it was. It is not as readily available as some of the salary data we presented to you regarding the Columbia campus faculty vs. the Regional Campus faculty salaries that we presented back in the Fall. So we are still searching for a decent source of data that doesn't have to be massaged too much to make sense; and we are still working on that.

The Welfare Committee reelected me as Chair.

C. System Affairs: Professor Roy Darby

(Beaufort) A written report was submitted.

(Attachment 3)

V. Executive Committee: Professor Robert Costello (Sumter)

The Executive Committee met on Friday, March 28 in the USC Columbia Faculty House.

Concerns originating on the Sumter campus pertaining to scheduling were discussed. These included the issue of procedures for setting and obtaining approval of academic calendars, which was referred to the Rights & Responsibilities Committee before the February meeting and the new issue of the impact on academics of trying to schedule all commencements within the same week.

Beaufort representatives to the USC Columbia Faculty Senate are interested in exploring the possibility of participating in and voting via TV instead of having to travel to Columbia each month. Beaufort also expressed concerns regarding the extent of their travel to RCFS meetings under the current system of scheduling. This will be discussed in the August retreat of the Executive Committee.

The status of committee work was reviewed.

The process whereby our actions on qualifications for academic rank will progress was discussed. This will presumably be brought up by our representatives on the Academic Advisory Council when it meets with new Provost Jerry Odom in April.

Several aspects of our Manual and procedures were questioned. Dr. Duffy expressed concern that the terminal degree requirement that has been installed by the Administration is not in our Manual. It also was pointed out that our Regional Campuses Tenure & Promotion Committee letters to applicants contain no deadline for requesting a review of committee action. This latter question was referred to Rights & Responsibilities.

Dr. Duffy noted that CHE action on BAIS has been postponed until October.

Ellen Chamberlain indicated she will need names of suggested replacement members for those leaving the Academic Advisory Council; she will appoint new members in their places.

The status of the RCFS publication, currently called Professor as Teacher, was discussed. Susan Pauly is retiring as Editor, and its future is in doubt. Interested persons should contact Susan.

A plaque was presented to outgoing Chair Jerry Dockery, who passed the gavel to Ellen Chamberlain. Jerry will be presenting a paper in New Orleans at the time of the April meeting.

The Vice Chair, after I finish the report on today's meeting of the Executive Committee, will review the status of motions, which is one of the charges for the Vice Chair each year.

Today we decided that we will review the status of System communications including use of the web site, etc., at the Executive Committee retreat in August and develop recommendations at that time. We also discussed a concern about how to obtain Regional Campuses Faculty Senate directory information in a timely manner. We'd like to be able to make up a directory that has the name of each Senator, what campus they represent, their telephone extension, their E-mail address, what committee they're on, and how long their term lasts, and have that right from the start. We feel that would improve communications on the Senate. We still have a little information missing on that at this juncture for this year; so we're going to be trying to get that at the Executive Committee retreat and I would hope that everyone who represents a given campus will try to gather that information and bring it to the meeting in August.

Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): As Vice Chair, it was my responsibility to track the motions that had been passed in the past year. I started last April, 1996. There was one motion which was "Each unit of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate will designate a campus E-mail address on that campus initially for the dissemination of course and curriculum information." That motion passed and I understand it's still in progress.

There were no motions at the September 20, 1996 meeting.

November 15 a motion was passed to have the

University 16

Conflict of Interest Committee included under Other Committees on the Agenda. That motion passed and has been implemented.

February 14, 1997 a motion was that the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate accept the teaching plus scholarship definition of scholarship as the definition by which tenure and promotion decisions are made on the Regional Campuses and that the definition be included in the appropriate appendix of the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual. That motion passed, but its present status is in progress. We have yet to receive a reaction from the Provost's Office on that.

Professor Costello: That concludes the Executive Committee report.

## VI. Reports from Special Committees

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

The Library Committee met two weeks ago for the first time this semester. We talked about the remote storage facility, the budget, and some special collection topics. Other details will be attached in a memo to the Secretary. (Attachment 4)

Dr. Duffy: Has anything been done about the South Caroliniana Library?

Professor Catalano: Yes. George Terry reported on a number of different things. One is that there has been a request to the President's office for immediate help and they've taken that to the Board of Trustees, and there also has been an approach made to the Legislature about a special appropriation to take care of it. I think the Administration realizes the sad shape it's in and within the next year there should be plans to redo the thing. It looks like it's going to cost close to a million dollars.

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

This year has been an exceptionally busy one for Courses and Curricula. A great deal of time has been spent on considering the Maymester courses for Columbia. More recently and probably of greater import to this body: the School of Business Administration has submitted an extensive revision of its degree program. As always, I refer you to the official minutes of the Columbia Faculty Senate. Now, as an aside, I haven't seen the published minutes of this group

for several blue moons now, but the minutes do appear and can be downloaded from the worldwide web and there is an http address which will be part of the minutes. As another aside, I note with some disappointment that the School of Criminal Justice did not choose to alter the title of their Maymester course Criminal Justice 591M: Women and Girls in Criminal Justice. I had suggested a change to the title of that noteworthy movie, "Babes Behind Bars."

The changes to the Business Administration curriculum allow me to again raise a point that I have raised every year for the past three years. Is there some guidance for me from our Campuses? What concerns should I raise when such matters come before the Committee with respect to the Business program? Are there any guiding principles that would reflect the will of all of our campuses? In an extension of this concern, I must now confess my disappointment and chagrin that my attempts this year to improve the communication between me and the faculty and the administrations of the different campuses has not been entirely successful. I am continuing to work on this. I must do a better job. However, I suggest that in giving guidance and providing support for the communication process, that this group needs to do a better job also.

Questions?

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): Professor Castleberry, we feel your pain.

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

A written report was submitted. (Attachment 5)

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

A handwritten report was submitted and is typed in below.

The Academic Affairs and Faculty Liason Committee met April 3, 1997. Personnel matters were discussed in Executive Session. During open session, a discussion on a grievance was made.

In addition, Mission Statements from each campus were approved. The following program proposals were approved:

- 1.. A request to establish a Master of Science Degree in Applied Clinical Psychology, USC Aiken
2. A change from A.S. in Business to A.S.B with a major in Business, USC Lancaster

3. A request to offer a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration at the University Center in Greenville, USC Spartanburg
4. A change in degree name and concentration from Master of Arts in Theatre to Master of Arts in Theatre and Speech, USC Columbia
5. A request to offer the PMBA Program for the Duke Power Company in Charlotte, NC via Distance Education
6. A request to offer RN-BSN Program at Mary Black School of Nursing via Distance Education, USC Spartanburg

That is the end of my report, but you have heard other people that have occupied this seat try to convey what goes on and I just need to say that those of you who are junior faculty who are expecting to apply for tenure need to be very certain that you understand what the requirements are for tenure and that you are meeting them. And the only way that can be done is if the Provost agrees with our Campuses concerning how we define scholarship. It is very difficult for me to sit in grievance hearings for individuals who have been rejected for tenure and watch faculty members in an adversarial relationship with the Provost, when the Provost says anyone knows what good scholarship is. A faculty member does not have a defense in that case because the Board of Trustees listens to what the Provost says. So in the meeting on the 25th I urge those of you that are participating to begin a dialog with the Provost so that our junior faculty are not left in a position where they can't get tenure. Some of us know the things that have been happening around the system; and they continue. It's just same song, different verse.

Professor Robeert Castleberry (Sumter): Would you repeat or at least paraphrase the thing about the Associate Degree in Business?

Professor West: It was mainly a code change for Lancaster, but really what it entailed is that Lancaster is no longer offering what has been called Commercial and Secretarial Science as part of their business program, but instead they are referring to it as Administrative Information Management and Business Information Systems, and rather than having an A.S. Degree in Business, it is an A.S.B. with a major in Business. What they wanted was just a code change, and so I assume that the code instead of being an A.S. degree is now an A.S.B. degree.

Dean Carpenter (Sumter): Associate of Science in Business

Professor West: That's right, but the way it was worded on the thing that went to the Board of Trustees was an A.S.B degree in Business and that's what I read and that's what

was confusing.

Professor Castleberry: The only reason I raised this point is that essentially if it's just a code change OK, but if it's actually an alteration of the program, it's my concern.

Professor West: It's not a change in the program; it's a code change and I think it's for computer purposes, sort of like going from UCAM to RCAM.

Dr. Duffy: That was mandated by the Commission after review of the two Lancaster programs. We thought we could do it without going to the Board, but were told otherwise.

Professor West: It's a formality.

Professor Roy Darby (Beaufort): Carolyn, did I understand you correctly that Aiken is going to offer an M.S. in Applied Clinical Psychology?

Professor West: You need to remember that what goes before this Committee is advisory to the Board of Trustees and so it must be voted on by the Board of Trustees; and following that it goes to CHE. But at this point the Committee has approved an M.S. degree at Aiken in applied psychology. The only other one in the State is at Francis Marion.

Professor Tandy Willis (Union): Carolyn, the first item you mentioned was a grievance issue. Was that concerning a grievance procedure?

Professor West: It was not from the Regional Campuses. It was from Aiken.

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

The SPAR Committee met a few weeks ago and distributed \$30,000 to six recipients. I would again encourage you to go back to your campuses and get people to submit grants. We are underrepresented; and if we subtract the individuals who did not qualify for that particular category for one reason or another or simply didn't make much of a preparation then we're funding at about 25% which is excellent. So tell people to take a shot at it.

F. Other Committees

1. Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness:  
Professor Mary Barton (Beaufort)

Complete copies of the documentation for two student

evaluation instruments have been distributed to committee members who will share this information with their colleagues. Roy Darby has prepared some guidelines for the administrative use of student evaluations. These guidelines have also been distributed to Committee members for dissemination and discussion. One point of interest that has developed this year is that the Columbia assessment committee is also considering the issue of student evaluations and the feasibility of a common instrument. The Regional Campuses Faculty Senate may want to monitor the progress of that committee so that we might avoid having an evaluation instrument selected for us that does not fit our needs

Professor Carolyn West (Sumter): The ones that are being distributed, what are they?

Professor Barton: They are two commercial ones.

Professor Roy Darby (Beaufort): One of them is the ETS and the other is IDEA.

Professor West: You might just be aware that the new Provost was very much involved in Science and Math in developing a new evaluation instrument for that College. I had to get a copy for another reason and he called me back and said he would like to know what I thought of it and if our campuses used it he'd like to know the results. Apparently it's been very closely monitored in terms of validity and all the things that we always protest about instruments. So they're quite proud of it and it's used as an example on the campus, if you call anybody else. For instance, I had called one of the people who had been in charge of the campus wide report that came out on the assessment; and they pointed me to what Math and Science was doing. So the reason I wanted to know the name was because I was wondering if it was theirs. One of the things the Provost said yesterday was that **when we submit our teaching effectiveness scores we need to be certain that they include means and standard deviations.** For instance, on our campus we don't have standard deviations and we now have a Provost who knows what that means. We no longer have somebody in music, and so I think that's something you need to talk about on the 25th also.

Professor Darby: I think it's great that they did their own form and they think it has validity and reliability; but one of the problems with that, Carolyn, is the lack of a very large database from which you can derive specific normative data like looking at all two year English professors and with the small data sample that undoubtedly they have they can't make such comparisons, which is why we elected to



recommend a commercial form.

Professor West: We don't have any validity and reliability currently.

Professor Darby: Right. It's crazy and we've known that for four years and here we are and we still haven't gotten it.

Professor John Logue (Sumter): Another thing we may keep in mind is that the Provost was expected to approve and purchase this for us.

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

No conflicts have reached that Committee yet.

## VII. Special Orders

### Elections

In the absence of further nominations from the floor, it was moved and seconded that the slate of officers and committee representatives proposed by the Nominating Committee be accepted.

**Thee motion passed.**

## VIII. Unfinished Business

### A. motion from Rights and Responsibilities

A printed copy of this motion was submitted. (Attachment 6)

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): Is there any discussion?

Professor Stephen Anderson (Sumter): Let me if I may start the discussion with our rationale. It was pointed out during the Executive Committee that there was a timeline missing from that very sentence because as it read "... you may do so in writing to me," and did not leave any kind of timeline so it suggested an infinite turnaround time. As we look at page F-18 in that same Manual which we approved, the flow chart suggests that there is no such thing as an appeal nor grievance until after the Board of Trustees has voted. If there is no appeal available to the faculty member at that point, there **is** no need for a timeline; so instead of amending it to include a timeline we move that it be struck entirely from page C-6.

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter): Just a point of

information or a request for information. Under "current perceived processes" at what point could someone ask for a review of a decision? Was it at that level and at no earlier level?

Professor Anderson: As of the old Manual?

Professor Castleberry: What was the perceived process whether it was reality or not?

Professor Anderson: I can't answer for others' perceptions. I can speak from experience that appeals have taken place immediately after the Provost's decision and I believe I am speaking correctly when I say appeals have taken place directly to the T & P Committee of the Regional Campuses.

Professor John Catalano (Lancaster): At the September meeting we eliminated from C-7 the sentence ending "... any applicant dissatisfied with the recommendations of the Committee may appeal in writing to the Committee through the Committee Chair within two weeks of receiving notification;" so we voted to eliminate that level of appeal earlier in the year. We just didn't take it out of the letter which the Chair was to write to the individual people. I think it was the intent to remove that before.

Professor John Logue (Sumter): Part of the impetus for this was related to the fact that when we redid the T & P guidelines we were told that the candidate could not have access to his or her file at any point through the process until the process was complete. At one time, we attempted to have the candidate have access to all information as it went through the entire process. We were told that that was not possible. That, in effect, eliminates any possibility of an appeal. Individuals did not have information as to why they had been turned down at any level prior to the release of the entire file upon appeal at the end. This was the rationale for the change.

Professor Chamberlain: It certainly is a substantive issue, and the Chair will formally rule that ...

Professor Anderson: Is it substantive if we are not changing policy, but simply changing procedures to fit policy?

Professor Chamberlain: It would not be. That's a very good point.

The motion (Attachment 6) was reread.

**The motion passed.**

B. two motions from System Affairs

Professor Roy Darby (Beaufort): I think I may have done this incorrectly. I tried to consolidate the request to approve the guidelines in a single motion. I don't think I can do that, so I'm going to try this and we'll see if it works.

**The System Affairs Committee moves that the Courses and Curricula Guidelines appended hereto be approved by the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate.**

That's our first motion and needs no second.

**The Committee also moves that the approval of these guidelines/instructions be postponed until the first meeting of the 1997-1998 academic year.**

That's a motion to postpone from the Committee.

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): We have to look at those separately, don't we?

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter): I believe the move to postpone supercedes the original motion and requires immediate action.

Professor Darby: Right, that's why I'm doing it this way because otherwise it's illogical. We can't move endorsement and postponement simultaneously I don't think; so the motion as I understand it on the floor is to postpone consideration of that motion.

**The motion to postpone passed.**

Professor Darby: The second motion:

**The System Affairs Committee moves that the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate approve the use of live-via satellite TV technology with E-mail access for transmission of the proceedings of the University of South Carolina Faculty Senate to the Regional Campuses and *Continuing* Education.**

Professor Tye Johnson (Salkehatchie): You had mentioned earlier when you brought this up that you recognized that physical presence was important. Do you think it advisable that you suggest at least some minimum number of physical attendance at those meetings?

Professor Darby: That certainly is a possibility. The urgency on this motion has to do with the fact that this summer they are going to be conducting renovations of

Gambrell Hall and in order to incorporate the possibility for doing this we wanted to at least get approval of the technology. I think we could either add such a stipulation or at a future time as a separate motion we could set guidelines.

Professor Castleberry: In the discussion in Committee it was noted that what this will allow is for people who really have an inability to go to the meeting to actually be able to manage to attend and to vote. It was recognized that there may be items on occasion which really demand the physical presence behind a disembodied voice speaking to an issue. how that was managed was to be left up to the individual faculty.

Professor Nancy Washington (Continuing Education): I think we're getting into micromanagement here. Some people indeed would come every time if they could; others might not be able to and therefore not participate. If we could maybe add a sentence about when feasible or when not feasible to attend in person and let the individual Senators decide.

Professor Chamberlain: Are you suggesting that the motion be amended and include that language?

Professor Washington: Not necessarily, but I would prefer that language over a specific number of times per semester.

Professor Chamberlain: I don't believe at this time there is any mention of a specific number of times. Is there?

Professor Darby: It was just approval of the method.

Professor Carolyn West (Sumter): I'd just like to have it clarified why this is important for this body to discuss because these representatives are not really representatives of this body. They are representatives of each of our campuses; so they don't have a formal connection with this body, which has always been a problem.

Professor Babet Villena-Alvarez (Beaufort): This motion really started from the Welfare and Governance Committee here at USC Beaufort which I chair. What happened was that our Senators to the USC Faculty Senate in Columbia had problems attending 9 times a year for a three year term on Wednesday afternoon when we have to drive five hours per round trip for a meeting that would sometimes last an hour. So they made the proposal to do the live satellite with E-mail access. We were just proposing this for our campus. And so I went ahead and spoke with Professor Henry Price about the possibility, and they got excited about the possibility because of the amount of professor time we would be saving

and the dollars we would be saving for reimbursed travel time. So he spoke with then Provost Don Greiner who didn't see any problems with that, and then with Susan Bridwell in Distance Ed. We do have the technology to do this; and also the office pointed out that Gambrell Hall would be in thus it renovations this summer and would be a good thing the for us to pass this through Regional Campuses Faculty go Senate. That way they could ahead and incorporate the necessary technology in the renovations in Gambrell Hall this summer. And so the details of whether we actually had to physically send our. Senators there or not we first suggested will be up to the individual campuses. We just wanted to have the possibility.

Professor Darby: I think Carolyn's question, though, was why do we as a Faculty Senate have to decide this or rule on it.

Professor Alvarez: Professor Henry Price told me there had to be a resolution from our body.

Professor West: I would bet when he said that Professor Henry Price doesn't understand our organization relative to his organization. All of those people don't represent our body. It seems like there would have to be a resolution from each faculty organization instead of this body.

Professor Chamberlain: But this body represents the combined faculty organizations of all the Regional Campuses.

Professor John Logue (Sumter): Did I hear you say that he wanted this for purposes of getting that put into Gambrell Hall in the renovation process?

Professor Alvarez: Since the renovations are happening this summer they wanted our body to make a resolution so that they could start making the changes this summer.

Professor Logue: So it sounds like they needed this for their own internal purposes.

Professor Chamberlain: Well, we may use that room ourselves as a meeting room for the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate when we meet on the Columbia Campuses so that members of our faculties who cannot attend or do not wish to attend can also participate **in** those meetings. So it would be of benefit to' our organization as well.

Is there any more discussion on this motion?

**The motion passed.**

IX. New Business

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): I do have one item; and I believe that it comes under new business. I have received information from the campuses with the exception of Continuing Education, and we have been asked by the Interim Provost to provide committee membership names to the Academic Advisory Council. A number of those people are due to go off this year and the Provost wanted to know who would be coming on. I have received that information and I will make the following appointments.

Sumter:	Robert Castleberry, John Logue
Lancaster:	John Catalano, Danny Faulkner
Salkehatchie:	Wayne Chilcote
Continuing Ed:	Mike Schoen

Members already serving whose terms end next year are

Beaufort:	Ellen Chamberlain, Roy Darby
Continuing Ed:	Jerry Dockery, Marion Dunlap
Salkehatchie:	Larry West
Union:	Jean Denman

#### X. Announcements

Professor Tandy Willis (Union): The second meeting of the Regional Campuses Academic Advisory Council is on the 25th of this month. Two representatives from each campus meet with the Provost. We are meeting with the new Provost and this should be a learning experience for all of us. If you are not on that Committee and you have any concerns you'd like addressed, you should bring it up with your representative.

Professor Bruce Nims (Lancaster): I'd like to pass on a communication from Carolyn Taylor who is Chair of our Special Events and Lectures Committee. (Attachment 7)

Dean Chris Plyler (Beaufort): The agenda erroneously reports that we are having a reception for you at the end of this meeting; and we are not.

Professor Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): I have one for Jerry Dockery. He would like you to know that the American Association of University Professors is holding its Spring 1997 assembly at Aiken on Saturday, April 19. The speaker is Professor Jeffrey Butz of Appalachian State University, who is going to talk on the national attack on tenure.

#### XI. Adjournment

Professor Ellen Chamberlain adjourned the meeting. 27

## Overview of Proposed Performance Funding Model

- Task Force Measures and Definitions -remain as adopted
- Sector Committee reports will, serve as guiding principles

Commission will analyze and evaluate performance

### Model Outline

#### Determination of Performance Score (Please refer to attached table)

- Institutions will report current status and propose annual institutional benchmarks
- Commission will develop sector averages/benchmarks and approve institutional benchmarks
- At end of the assessment period, institutions will report actual results
- Commission will evaluate results (range of 0 - 5) considering achievement of institutional benchmarks, comparison to other institutions' performance, and sector average and benchmark
- Indicator evaluations are totaled and divided by the maximum potential score (# of indicators x 5) to yield a performance percentage

#### Determination of Allocation (Please refer to attached Resource Allocation Plan package)

- Commission will calculate need based on a Mission Resource Requirements model which will consider mission, program mix, and size of respective institutions
- The Commission will create a pool of funds (up to a maximum of \$5 million) to be allocated for performance improvement projects.
- Actual appropriations are first divided by sector, based on sector share of total determined requirement
- Performance percentage is applied to institution's determined requirement, to yield an allocation amount

## Higher Education Performance Indicators 1997-98

Rating Scale:

1- Non-Compliance

2 - Needs Improvement

3 - Satisfactory Progress . 4

- Meets Goal

5 - Exceeds Goal..... Performance)

(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance)

Indicator Number & Description	eras		Beginning			Commission Rating
<b>Focus</b>						
C. Approval of a mission statement						
<b>II. Quality of faculty</b>						
D. Compensation of faculty						
<b>III. Instructional Quality</b>						
A. Class sizes and student/teacher ratios						
B. Number of credit hours taught by faculty						
c. Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees						
D. Accreditation of degree granting programs						
<b>IV. Administrative Efficiency</b>						
r Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs						
D. Amount of general overhead costs						
<b>V. Entrance Requirements</b>						
A SAT and ACT scores of student body						
D. Priority on enrolling in-state students						
<b>VII. Graduates' Achievements</b>						
D. scores of graduates on post-graduate or employment -related examinations and certification tests						
F.. Credit hours earned of graduates						
<b>VIII User-Friendliness of Institution</b>						
c Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the, State						
<b>E%. Research Funding</b>						
B. Amount of Public and Private Sector Gran						



	Total Rating	
	Maximum Potential Rating	

J

## Performance Rating Criteria

Score	Description
6	Exemplary performance. Performance substantially exceeds institutional and sector benchmarks and represents extraordinary effort.
5	Exceeds goals. Performance is above institutional and sector benchmarks.
4	Meets goals. Performance meets institutional and sector benchmarks.
3	Satisfactory progress: Performance falls below institutional and sector benchmarks but represents progress toward goals.
2	Needs improvement: Performance falls below institutional and sector benchmarks.
1	Non-compliance: Performance falls below institutional and sector benchmarks and institution exhibits no effort to improve.

REPORT OF THE VICE PROVOST & EXECUTIVE DEAN  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES & CONTINUING EDUCATION

John J. Duffy

TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

April 4, 1997

- Salary at this point is 2.5% with no cap, effective July 1, 1997
  
- Bond bill passed second reading on April 2
  
- Debate on the Palmetto Scholarship
  
- BAIS Status
  
- New phone system at Union will be operating at Noon on May 15. The T1 has been ordered and should be here by April 21 with an anticipated date for backbone connectivity of mid-June.
  
- Strategic Plan Meetings are: Beaufort April 8 at 2:00 pm  
Sumter - April 8 at 3:00 pm  
Union - April 8 at 4:00 pm  
Lancaster - April 18 at 11:00 am  
Salk - April 21 at 4:00 pm  
RCCE - April 22 at 2:00 pm

## ***DIVISION OF BUSINESS AND FINANCE***

---

### ***BUDGET ALERY***

To: Chancellor Robert Alexander, USC Aiken  
Chancellor John Stockwell, USC Spartanburg  
Dean Chris Plyler, USC Beaufort  
Dean Joseph Pappin, USC Lancaster  
Dean Carl Clayton, USC Salkehatchie  
Dean Leslie Carpenter, USC Sumter  
Dean James Edwards, USC Union

From: Sue Hooks

Date: March 19, 1997

Subject: Ways and Means Recommendation for Bond Bill

The House Ways and Means Committee completed its deliberations on the Bond Bill this afternoon. The bill was reported out favorably as a Committee bill. Representative Boan recommended an amendment that made changes to the regional. campus project authorizations. The following changes were made to the Joint Bond Review Committee recommendation:

USC Lancaster Library Repairs-project deleted (425,000)	USC Lancaster
Library Expansion-project reduced (500,000)	USC Beaufort Beaufort College-
project increase 225,000	USC Salkehatchie Reroofing-project increase
200,000	USC Sumter Deferred Maintenance-project increase 200,000
USC Union Maintenance-new project	300,000

The attached is a side-by-side comparison of the Governor, the Joint Bond Review Committee and the Ways and Means Committee recommendations for each project authorization. The bill now moves on to the House for further debate.

cc: Lyles Glenn  
John Duffy John  
Finan Johnny Gregory  
Shirley Mills  
Campus Business Officers

1997 BOND BILL RECOMMENDATIONS

AGENCYPROJECT	Governor Recommend	JBRC Recommend	waNIC Recommend
<b>NEW CONSTRUCTION</b>			
1 USC Coladiraquats Sciance Research Center	4,384,066	4,384,065	4,384,065
2 Clemson-Central Energy	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
3 Peidmont Teen-EdlStudent Srvs/Admin Bldg.	3,582,500	4,750,000	4,750,000
4 College of Charleston-New Library	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
5 Lander-Science Hal Renovate and Equip	750,000	3,325,000	3,325,000
6 USC Spart.-Hodge Center Renovation	1,987,600	1,987,500	1,987,500
7 Chest Marl. Tech-Insttuational Ubrary	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
8 Winthrop-Sclenees/Math Bldg.	6,750,000	6,750,000	6,760,000
9 SC State-eusiness School	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
10 Coos Humanities Bldg.	11,775,000	11,775,000	11,775,000
11 USC Aiken-New Nursing Bldg.	1,500,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
12 Citadel-Thompson Hell	6,262,000	6,282,000	6,282,000
13 Lowcountry Tech-Heal h Science Bldg.	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
14 Francis Marion-Energy Facility Upgrade	875,250	875,250	875,250
15 SC State-Fine Arts Bldg.	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,500,000
16 York Tech-AAalScernx6 Bldg.	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
17 Midlands TedMkport-Clssraan Bldg.	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
18 SC State-ASE Sciences Bldg	500,000	500,000	0
18 SC Steve-Camp Daniel Renovation	600,000	600,000	60,000
20 Florence Darlington Tech	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
21 USC Alimn-Scisnces Building	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
22 Harry-George. Ted.Conway-Lixary/Supp Snre.	0	3,250,000	3,250,000
23 Harry-George. T n	0	750,000	750,000
24 USC LancasteaUbray Expansion	0	4,500,000	4,000,000
25 Trident Tech-AaPner Campus Renovation	0	3,100,000	3,100,000
Subtotal. New Construction	88,616,315	103,978,816	103,478,816
<b>DEFERRED MAINTENANCE</b>			
26 USC Lancaster-IJbnyary Repairs	428,000	425,000	0
27 MUSC-Buliding Watertightness	8,752,086	8,752,086	8,752,088
28 USC Sch of Med-Rero05ng	360,000	360,000	350,000
29 USC Salkehatchle-Reroofna	336,000	336,000	536,000
30 SC State-Steam Distribution System	875,000	875,000	875,000
31 Technical Colleges-Deferied MBIntlEquip	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
32 USC Beaufart-84auroR College Bldg Renovate	868,600	859,500	1,081,500
33 USC CokrHistoric Colleges Renovation	14,500,000	14,500,000	10,500,000
34 Greenvdle Tech-Engfrechnology Bldg Renovetio	0	5,225,000	5,225,000
36 USC Sumter-Deferred Maintenance	0	200,000	400,000
36 USC Union -Maintenance	0	0	300,000
Subtotal, Data. Maintenance	35,096,686	41,521,588	42,021,686
<b>OTHER STATE AGENCIES</b>			
36 Dept Of Corrections Fadlites	74,700,000	54,700,000	54,700,000
37 School Math & Scene.New Bldg Final 2 Phases	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
38 DNR-EnvironmeAW Preservetion (Jocose Gorge)	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
39 Emergency Prep. DNision.Reloeatton	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
40 Clemson PSA-GreenhouseIAgncuhure Complex	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
41 DJJ-Coastal R&E Center	4,250,000	4,250,000	4,250,000
42 11J.1-Evaluation Centers Moditircations	160,0	180,000	160,000
43 DJJ-Greenwood Center Renovation Completion	475,000	475,000	475,000
44 DJJ-New Marine Institute Bldgs.	500,000	500,000	500,000
45 DJJ-Errwrgency Power Generators	750,000	750,000	750,000
46 DJJ-Prison Industries Brig.	325,000	325,000	325,000
47 ETV -Technology Bldg. Payment	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
48 Dept. of CommemwAirpof Improvements	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Other Agencies	126,160,000	106,160,000	106,160,000
Grand Total, All Agencies	\$249,872,901	\$250,660,401	5260.660,401
Total USC Profecb	26,841,066	31,541,066	31,241,065

Report of the  
System Affairs Committee  
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate

April 4, 1997

The Committee unanimously elected Steve Bishoff (Sumter) as its Chair for the 1997-1998 academic year.

The Committee first considered Senator Castleberry's draft of the Guidelines and Instructions which is will be appended to the minutes of this meeting. After much discussion, the Committee approved a final draft. Copies of the final draft approved by the Committee will be sent to the Committee representatives of each campus and Continuing Education. The Committee will submit a motion under new business asking for the approval of this document and also that voting on this motions be postponed until the first meeting of the 1997-1998 academic *year*. The motion reads as:

The System Affairs Committee moves that:

The Courses and Curricula, Guidelines and Instructions appended hereto be approved by the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate.

and that,

the approval of these Guidelines and Instructions be postponed until the first meeting of the 1997-1998 academic year.

There are several procedures that will need clarification and, perhaps, modification and these issues will be addressed by future sessions of the System Affairs Committee.

The Committee then addressed a proposal from Senator Babet Villena-Alvarez (Beaufort) brought forth from that campus requesting approval of the use of satellite television technology in conjunction with the USC Faculty Senate meetings. Senators on the remote campuses often have difficulty in attending meetings on Wednesdays on the Columbia campus every semester for three years. The feasibility of using existing technology to allow senators who cannot be physically present at all meetings has been explored and discussed with the Chair of the USC Senate, the interim Provost and with Vice-Provost Duffy. The consensus opinion is that such use will greatly enhance participation of the Regional Campuses in the USC senate and will represent a savings of valuable faculty time and likely a savings of funds. The specific technology being contemplated will allow Senators at remote\_ sites to actively participate in discussions as well as vote in the proceedings. The Committee, however, does recognize the importance of a physical presence at such meetings as logistics and time allow. Therefore, the Committee brings to the Senate a resolution to approve the use of such technology. (See Motion).

The Committee then considered the charge of the Chair to create a position of Webmaster for the RCFS homepage. After discussion, the Committee felt that this issue would best be considered by the Executive Committee, perhaps at its summer retreat. However, the

Committee also wished to recognize the great energy, time and dedication put in by Senator Steven Anderson (Sumter) in creating and maintaining the RCFS home page.

Finally, the Committee received a proposed wording of a statement regarding the responsibilities of RCFS senators to their home campuses for inclusion in the manual for new senators. This wording will be transmitted by the incoming chair of the Committee to the Secretary of the Senate at the Executive Committee Retreat.

April 4, 1997

A Motion  
from the System Affairs Committee  
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate

The System Affairs Committee moves that:

The Regional Campuses Faculty Senate approve the use of available distance education technology for transmission of the proceedings of the University of South Carolina Faculty Senate to the Regional Campuses and Continuing Education.



April 4, 1997

A Motion  
from the System Affairs Committee  
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate

The System Affairs Committee moves that:

The Courses and Curricula Guidelines and Instructions appended hereto be approved by the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate.

and that,

the approval of these Guidelines and Instructions be postponed until the first meeting of the 1997-1998 academic year.

**Date:** 03/26/97

**To:** RCFS

**CC:** Professor Costello

**From:** John Catalano

**RE:** Faculty Committee on Libraries, Meeting of March 26, 1997

---

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bushong, who presented a proposed resolution concerning the renovation of South Caroliniana Library. The committee unanimously supported the resolution. Vice Provost Terry then reported. He spoke of a legislative effort concerning the South Carolinians. He also reported that although this year's budget is in balance, inflationary pressures make next year's budget appear tenuous. He also gave a security update. Professor Patrick Scott (Director of Special Collections) updated us on his department. The collection is over 70,000 volumes with increased utilization. Mr. McNally reported on the progress of the remote storage facility (to open in August, 1998), the notable materials home page, department visitations, and minor changes to the library's

*hours of operation. The next meeting will be April 23<sup>d</sup> and I'll be unable to attend as*

I'll be giving a paper in Germany that day.

Respectfully submitted

Report to the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate  
April 4, 1997

USC Faculty Welfare Committee

The primary issue being considered by the USC Faculty Welfare Committee concerns proposed revisions to University Policy EOP 1.02: Sexual Harassment which was submitted to the University Community for consideration by the Equal Opportunity Programs Office. Copies of the proposed changes *and* the Faculty Welfare Committee response to these revisions are appended to this report for inclusion in the minutes.

Essentially, these revisions address two issues: (1) who should have access to information gathered during the course of an investigation of sexual harassment allegations, and (2) modifications to the time frame in which the EOP Office is given to complete its investigation, University Counsel must issue an opinion and in which the Deciding Officer (e.g., the Campus Dean) must issue a written decision. The periods are doubled, although the time allowed the parties remains the same.

The Faculty Welfare Committee's concerns regarding the first issue are that the parties to the complaint, especially the object of the complaint would not have access to all the information necessary to prepare adequately a defense. Although Mr. Gist, the EOP, Executive Assistant to the President for Equal Opportunity Programs, indicated that the critical information would be provided to the parties, the wording of the policy change is ambiguous as to what information will be provided and when.

The Faculty Welfare Committee's reservations concerning the second issue center around assuring that there will be a speedy resolution to the harassment case. The Committee makes the case that lengthening the length of time for investigation is not necessary nor will it alleviate the staffing problems claimed by EOP.

Concerned faculty members are urged to provide their input to the RCFS representative on the FWC for input into this discussion.

Roy Darby  
RCFS Representative  
USC Faculty Welfare Committee

# DRAFT

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Office of the Provost, Bobby Gist, Terry Parham  
FROM: Faculty Welfare Committee  
DATE: April 1, 1997  
RE: Proposed Revisions to Sexual Harassment Policy

The Faculty Welfare Committee has reviewed "Proposed Revisions to University Policy EOP 1.02: Sexual Harassment" submitted by the Equal Opportunity Programs Office and have met with Mr. Bobby Gist to discuss the purpose of the proposed changes. Based on the information before us, we submit the following comments for consideration by those acting on this proposal.

### Summary of Comments.

The Committee is concerned primarily with two proposed changes. The first change, to Policy II.G.4.g, would delete the parties as recipients of information received by the University during the investigation of a complaint. Although supportive of the purpose to minimize the likelihood of harassment of or retaliation against complainants and witnesses, the Committee does not believe that the best means to achieve that objective is to deny the parties access to information that is necessary to adequately defend against a charge. Moreover, the Committee is concerned that the policy does not clearly reflect the information normally available to the parties.

Second, a change to Policy H.G.4.f would double the time now permitted for completion of an investigation. The Committee believes that the change proposed would not solve current workload problems, but would institutionalize a backload of unresolved matters.

### Comments.

(1) **Policy II.G.4.g.** The proposed change to this policy would delete "the parties" as recipients of information obtained during an investigation of sexual harassment charges. The information would be available only to "University officials who have a need to know."

Mr. Gist has explained to the Committee that the purpose of this change is to reduce the chance for parties to harass or retaliate against witnesses or complainants. Parties may be more willing to come forward with information, if identifying information is not made available to the parties

## Proposed Revisions to University Policy EOP 1.02: Sexual Harassment

[NOTE: Strikeouts imply a proposed deletion from the current policy; words in bold type font imply a proposed addition to the current policy.]

At II.G.2:

2. Informal Resolution Procedures (Optional)

A person who believes that he or she has been the victim of sexual harassment should initially attempt to discuss the matter with the person(s) thought to have engaged in the harassment. This procedure may be the ~~quickest~~ **most effective** and least burdensome manner of resolving the problem.

At ILG.4.c.1 .i:

- (1) The settlement agreement must:
  - (I) **be voluntary and** be in writing;

At II.G.4.c.2:

- (2) The University EOP shall provide a copy of the settlement agreement to both parties, and shall file the original in the Equal Opportunity Programs Office **and a copy shall be maintained by the Office of Human Resources.**

At ILG.4.d:

- d. In the event the parties do not reach a **voluntary** settlement agreement, the University EOP shall conduct a full investigation which may include obtaining oral and/or written statements from any person either the complainant or the charged party has listed as a witness, as well as from

any other person who might have knowledge about the alleged offense.

• At IIG.4.f &g:

- f. The University EOP shall attempt to complete the investigation within ~~fifteen~~ **thirty** working days. Except in the most unusual circumstances, all investigation shall be completed within ~~thirty~~ **sixty** working days. **The sexual harassment investigative process is a non-adversarial procedure and there shall be no cross-examination of witnesses by either the Charged Party or the Complainant.**
- g. The University EOP shall treat all information received during the investigation as confidential and shall make it available only to ~~the parties and~~ appropriate University officials **who have a need to know.**

At II.G.5.c & d:

- c. The Report and Recommendation shall be sent to the Vice President for Human Resources, General Counsel, and to the appropriate University officer for decision. The Deciding Officer is the appropriate Vice President, Chancellor, or Regional Campus Dean. A ~~copy~~ **summary** of the Report and Recommendation shall then be provided to the complainant and the charged party.
- d. Either party may respond in writing to the **summary of the** Report and Recommendation. TV's response must be sent to the Deciding Officer within ten working days.

At II.G.6.b & c:

- b. If the charged party has alleged that the conduct is constitutionally protected, the Deciding Officer must obtain the written opinion of University counsel concerning this issue. University counsel shall provide that opinion within five ten working days after being requested to do so.
- c. The Deciding Officer shall render a final written decision within **ten twenty**

working days from the expiration of the time the parties have for filing responses to the University EOP's original or Supplementary Report and Recommendation, as the case may be, and shall serve a copy of that decision on both the complainant and the charged party.

At II.H.1:

1. A copy of this Policy shall be contained in the University Policies and Procedures ~~Manual~~. The name, phone number, and location of the University EOP, Campus Sexual Harassment Representative, Unit Liaison, and Chair of the Affirmative **Action** Advisory Committee, shall be posted on appropriate bulletin boards.

Added to the end of the policy:

### **III. Reason for Latest Revision**

**The revision changes certain completion times, and clarifies the language of several sections throughout the policy.**

The Committee, however, is concerned *that* any restriction on access to information not be prejudicial to the ability of a person to defend against claims. The Committee questioned Mr. Gist extensively about the extent of information that would be available under the revised policy to a person charged with harassment. Specifically, the Committee is concerned that a party be given sufficient information to know the specific circumstances in which the harassment allegedly occurred. This information would seem to require disclosure, at least, of the name of the person allegedly harassed. Also, the parties should know of the key witnesses supporting or rebutting the harassment claim.

Mr. Gist indicated that the person charged would not be denied *this* information, although the policy revision seems to suggest a contrary conclusion. It was not entirely clear to the Committee when critical information would be provided to the parties or under what policy authority it would be provided. If identifying information is provided to the parties despite this **policy**, it is not clear how this policy change will have any impact upon the likelihood of retaliation. In any event, the Committee is concerned that the proposed policy does not make clear what information is available or when. We urge that any change state clearly what information will be available and when it will be made available. At the very least, the party should have access to the names of the key participants and a summary of their allegations in the matter at a sufficiently early time to permit an adequate defense against the charges.

. Finally, the Committee believes that the proposal to provide information to university officials having "a need to know" is so vague as to be meaningless. Mr. Gist indicated that there is a more specific list *of officials who would "have a need to know"* and the policy should identify with greater specificity those persons.

(2) Policy II.G.4.f. The proposed change to this policy would double the time permitted for investigation from 15-30 working days to 30-60 working days. The justification for the revision is to bring the policy in line with current reality as to the time required. The Committee agrees that University policy should accurately reflect reasonable expectations, but is concerned that 12 weeks (60 working days) unnecessarily lengthens the period of the investigation stage. Both victim and defendant, as well as the institution, have an interest in speedy investigation of harassment charges.

The Committee is told that approximately 15-20 matters are investigated fully each year and that the staff of the Office is stretched thin in handling these matters and other complaints that may not require full investigation. It is not clear, however, that lengthening the expected time frame for investigation will alleviate any staffing problems. The same number of complaints will be received each year. On average, if the matters were spread evenly over the year, it would be necessary to complete each investigation within about 2-3 weeks to handle all the matters over the year. With two staff investigators, each investigation could last about 5 weeks. These time frames are consistent with current policy. If a longer investigate period is given, a reasonable expectation is that fewer matters will be completed each year and a backlog of complaints will develop without speedy resolution.

Normally the parties to each matter are readily available within the University Committee, a fact that would seem to favor relatively quick investigation. A policy could



include a proviso for special circumstances, such as when a party is on leave or otherwise absent for an extended period. Understanding, however, that there may be legitimate concerns that the Office is not now able to handle matters in the time frame currently allowed, the Committee believes that a more appropriate resolution is to hire a sufficient number of additional investigators to allow completion of the investigation within 3-6 weeks, as policy now provides.

cc: Faculty Advisory Committee

Motion from R&R Committee

The R&R Committee moves that two paragraphs be omitted from page C-6 in the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual (dated 6/3/96, approved up to the Board of Trustees as of 9/17/96) as struck out below:

"For candidates receiving a vote the by the Committee not to recommend, the Chair will have a letter prepared stating:

The Regional Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee met on (date) and does not recommend you for (promotion to \_\_\_\_\_ and/or tenure). ... upon by the Board of Trustees:

(start omission)

~~"If you wish to appeal the committee's action with regard to \_\_\_\_\_, you may do so in~~

AND...

"For candidates receiving a split vote with respect to tenure and promotion, the Chair will have a letter prepared for the candidate stating:

The Regional Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee met on (date) and recommends you for \_\_\_\_\_, however has not recommend you for \_\_\_\_\_ at this time ... upon by the Board of Trustees:

(start omission)

~~"If you wish to appeal the committee's action with regard to \_\_\_\_\_, you may do so in writing to me, through the Office of the Vice Provost as outlines in the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual"~~

(end omission)

UNIVERSITY OF  
South Carolina  
LANCASTER

April 4, 1997

Dear Colleagues:

We at USC Lancaster invite you and your department to a Faculty Colloquium featuring Dr. Mary Doria Russell, author of *The Sparrow*.

The colloquium will be held in Hubbard Hall Gallery on Friday, April 11, from 2:30 until 4:30 p.m. Light refreshments will be served; we look forward to your joining us.



Carolyn Taylor  
Chair  
Special Events & Lectures Committee