

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
USC Union
Union, SC
November 17, 1989

INFORMAL SESSION

The Senate Chair, Dr. Deborah Cureton, opened this session at 10:00 a.m. She expressed appreciation to USC Union for hosting the University Campuses Faculty Senate. Cureton then turned the floor to Ken Davis, Dean at USC Union. He and Betty Martin, administrative affairs dean, welcomed the members of the Senate and explained the arrangements for the day.

Other campus reports were heard from the following: USC Beaufort by Dean Bashaw; USC Lancaster by Professor Wayne Thurmond for Dean Arnold; Lifelong Learning by Dean May; USC Salkehatchie by Professor Frank Shelton for Dean Clayton. There was no campus report from USC Sumter as Dean Anderson could not attend today's Senate meeting. (For the record, the Sumter faculty organization is entitled to representation on the University Campuses Faculty Senate by nine senators. Professor Sal Macias attended today's meeting as the ninth senator from that campus and became a part of the System Affairs Committee.)

Before moving the Senate into its various committees, Chair Cureton recognized the following guests to today's meeting: Susan Bridwell, dean for telecommunications and independent learning; David Hunter; David Bell; Jim Edwards.

FORMAL SESSION

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair convened the Senate at 2:00 p.m.

II. CORRECTION/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the September 15, 1989, University Campuses Faculty Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

III. REPORTS FROM UNIVERSITY OFFICERS

A. JOHN DUFFY, CHANCELLOR

The written report from Dr. Duffy appears as an attachment to these minutes. The informal question and answer session that Dr. Duffy held with the Senate has been transcribed and also appears as an attachment to these minutes.)

B. JOHN GARDNER, VICE CHANCELLOR

(The written report submitted by Vice Chancellor Gardner is attached.)

At this point in the informal session of the Senate meeting, the University Campuses Faculty Senate was very fortunate to have been visited by Mr. Jack Whitener, Chairman of the Commission on Higher Education and Dean Emeritus at USC Union.

IV. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE Professor John Logue

The Rights and Responsibilities Committee convened at 10:30 and dealt with two main issues in the course of its meeting.

The first item of business was to discuss the definition of "faculty" on the University Campuses. Although the committee felt that each campus should have the right to define who should be a voting member of the faculty organization, it was determined that defining faculty rights might be a way of distinguishing the status of University Campuses faculty members from those of the technical colleges. Out of this discussion came the following motion that the committee would like to present to the Faculty Senate as a whole:

MOTION:

In the view of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, the move of the Commission on Higher Education to allow technical colleges to offer associate degrees in academic areas represents a significant erosion of public trust in academic higher education until and unless the Commission is prepared to: a. create faculties on the technical college campuses with the right to self governance; b. institute a system of tenure for faculty at the technical college campuses; c. provide meaningful guarantees that all faculty at technical college campuses, including adjunct faculty, have classroom autonomy.

MOTION CARRIED.

The Committee then considered Gordon Haist's proposal for a statement in the new Faculty Manual concerning faculty evaluation of administrators. After extensive discussion, a revised form of the proposal will be forwarded to the Faculty Manual Revision Committee.

B. WELFARE COMMITTEE

Professor Mary Barton

First of all, the Welfare Committee hopes for the speedy recovery of Dr. Milt Baker.

On behalf of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, the Welfare Committee of the group wants to apprise the Welfare Committee of the USC Columbia Faculty Senate of errors and misconceptions in Recommendation 2 (Minutes of October 23, 1989). USC Columbia receives significant political benefits at no financial cost. This Committee's concerns were referred to John Gardner for an informal approach to dealing with this problem.

Based on the current developments of the "college parallel" programs of the technical colleges combined with the recommendations made at the USC Columbia Faculty Senate Meeting on October 23, 1989, the Welfare Committee has a serious concern regarding the job security problems that may result from falling enrollments. A clarification of the question of tenure under such conditions was requested by the Committee.

C. SYSTEM AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Professor Paul Stone

A resolution is proposed to recognize Jack Anderson's efforts on the Tech issue:

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS Jack Anderson has tirelessly advocated and actively worked to preserve the integrity of the University of South Carolina System during his administrative tenure, and

WHEREAS he has had unparalleled foresight in his attempting to maintain the distinction between the academic mission of the University Campuses and the technical training mission of the tech schools, and

WHEREAS he has demonstrated exemplary leadership **on the** tech issue,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University Campuses Faculty Senate gratefully acknowledges his energetic and conscientious efforts on behalf of the University System.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED.

The Committee discussed the possibility of a system-wide catalog of courses. In lieu of other problems between system campuses, discussion was tabled.

The Committee discussed the visiting scholar issue and decided to expand it to include general interest topics as well as academic topics. Further work on this item was tabled until next meeting.

The Adult Learner baccalaureate degree was discussed. The Committee is in favor of this proposal and looks forward to working with Chancellor Duffy's office in developing this proposal.

V. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Rick Boulware

The Executive Committee has met twice since the last meeting of this Senate, and the following motions are a result of this Committee's deliberations:

MOTION FROM COMMITTEE:

That the University Campuses Faculty Senate endorse the statement of policy recommended by the System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee as stated by Provost Smith in his letter of June 14, 1989, to Rufus Fellers of the Columbia Faculty Senate --that students whose education is interrupted be given a grace period of five years to continue education under the same catalog.

MOTION PASSED.

MOTION FROM COMMITTEE:

That the University Campuses Faculty Senate, in order to complement efforts already being made, form immediately an ad hoc committee to promote the public image of the University Campuses, composed of one representative from each University Campus to be elected by the local faculty organizations, and that Greg Labyak be appointed temporary chair of the committee for the purpose of calling the committee's first meeting.

MOTION PASSED.

VI. REPORTS FROM SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE - Professor John Catalano

Dr. Arthur Young, Dean of Libraries, who has been at USC since October, was introduced to the committee by Vice President Terry.

A discussion of the committee's charge as well as its goals and objectives ensued. This included a discussion of how to get more faculty input.

Several concerns and issues were brought to the committee's attention, including reserve room policies, departmental allocation of serials, overdue books. No specific actions were taken by the committee at this time.

Information update: new computer lab in the Thomas Cooper Library; need for and plans to acquire additional CDROM data bases; Dr. Young is to speak at function of College of Information Science December 1.

B. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULA AND COURSES - Professor Robert Castleberry

I have sent two letters to the academic officers of the campuses since we last met. These detailed items under consideration by the committee and are only official upon approval by the Columbia Faculty Senate:

- MIST 103 was deleted but replaced with HIST 107 (Ancient Near Eastern Civilization).
- Psychology had a number of proposals. PSYC 227 now has a prerequisite of MATH 111. Only 6 hours of independent study courses are allowed to apply for a psychology major. Also, psychology majors need to take an animal biology course as part of the basic educational requirements,
- OADM 264 has had a change in description to "modernize" the course.

-Physics has suggested changes to the physics curriculum, including the creation of new courses (PHYS 205 & 303) and the deletion of others (PHYS 213 & 213L).

The committee is also working on (1) trying to standardize the wording of all the descriptions of independent study courses, and (2) the identification of courses in the curriculum which are not regularly taught (so that superfluous courses might be deleted).

C. UNIVERSITY FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE Professor Don Curlovic
The committee met on October 23, 1989, and approved a report on "Salaries, Budgets, and 2001" which was included with the Faculty Senate Agenda for Wednesday, November 1, 1989. It is recommended that all faculty read this report since its suggestions have implications which affect the University Campuses.

D. ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE Professor Bruce Nims
The Academic Planning Committee met on October 18 and November 15, 1989, at the Faculty House, USC Columbia. On October 18, the committee discussed its mission and Chair Alexander Gilchrist of USC Columbia agreed to meet with Provost Smith to get his opinions on what the committee's charge should be.

On November 15, the committee met with Provost Smith. He asked the committee to advise the President concerning a request by Coastal Carolina College for the submission of a letter of intent with the Commission on Higher Education to study the feasibility of offering masters degrees in education at Coastal. In addition, the committee decided to solicit factual data from the Faculty Welfare Committee of USC Columbia concerning several of its recommendations contained in a recent report to the Columbia Faculty Senate.

E. FACULTY/BOARD OF TRUSTEES LIAISON COMMITTEE - Professor Rod Sproatt

The committee met on November 9, 1989, to consider matters in executive and open sessions. Executive session: personnel matters; honorary degrees.

Open session: changed the composition of the committee to include the Chair-Elect of the Columbia Campus Senate; passed an extension of the Nurse Anesthetist program in the College of Nursing; passed and expanded the telecommunications component of the Master's Degree in Health Nursing, College of Nursing, USC Columbia, for family care practice; passed formation of the USC Cancer Research Center; discussion of the CHE vote to allow Tech schools to offer associate degrees.

F. RESEARCH AND PRODUCTIVE SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE Professor Tandy Willis

This is a very large committee which is divided into three smaller subcommittees: Engineering and Physical Sciences; Social and Behavioral Sciences; Arts and Humanities.

All three subcommittees met last week, and I have received the following information from SPAR (Sponsored Programs and Research) regarding the outcomes of those meetings: 1) Engineering and Physical Sciences had 20 proposals submitted to that

committee; 9 proposals were funded for a total of \$15,000; no applications were received from the University Campuses.2) Social and Behavioral Sciences had 11 proposals submitted,3 of which were funded for a total of \$8,551; no applications were received from the University Campuses; one proposal was received from USC Aiken.3) Arts and Humanities received 12 proposals, 9 of which were funded for a total of \$12,888; of the funded proposals, 1 from USC Aiken, 3 from USC Spartanburg, 1 from USC Salkehatchie.

The range of funding amounts from this committee is \$300 to \$3,000. Applications/proposals from the University Campuses are encouraged. There will be a second funding cycle which will occur in the spring semester. Applications from all University Campuses will be welcomed at that time.

G. SAVANNAH RIVER REVIEW COMMITTEE - Professor W. O. Lamprecht, Jr. (The report from Professor Lamprecht consists of two memoranda submitted by him to this Senate. These memoranda, dated April 24, 1989, and November 6, 1989, are attached to these Minutes.)

H. SYSTEM ACADEMIC POLICY COORDINATING & COMMITTEE - Professor Robert Costello

The committee met on November 16, 1989, in Columbia. The published agenda included three items: 1) reports on progress toward implementation of the new policy pertaining to which BULLETIN applies to graduation requirements for a student entering the system. 2) consideration of whether to modify the allowance of five years continuous absence by a student without losing the right to graduate under the BULLETIN requirements in effect at the time of original matriculation in the USC System. 3) desirability of maintaining a single grading system for all undergraduate programs.

At the request of Opal Brown of USC Columbia, action on all the aforementioned agenda items was deferred to consider proposals originating at USC Columbia to re-examine both the purpose and process of the committee. Her proposals included limitation of the scope of committee action to academic policy matters that are a part of the central student records and the requirement that all committee recommendations be approved by all five Senates before being passed on to the President.

Provost Smith pointed out that a major purpose of the committee as constituted by the President was to deal with important system issues upon which unanimity might not exist. He pointed out that the committee is a presidential advisory committee, not a creation of the Senates.

A lengthy discussion of autonomy concerns of Columbia and the four-year campuses ensued, with emphasis on how to balance these concerns with the desirability of better integrated system function. During the discussion, the Provost exhibited a clear understanding of the threat posed to the USC System by alternative agendas for higher education in our state. The meeting adjourned without action.

I. OTHER COMMITTEES

INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES COMMITTEE - Professor Jerry Dockery

This committee reviewed Midland Risk Company's proposal to offer personal automobile insurance on a payroll-deducted basis to USC employees who are law enforcement officers and graduates of the S.C. Criminal Justice Academy.

Because of the low numbers of USC employees **affected** (less than 100), the committee rejected the request based on Section 8-11-80 of the S.C. Code of Laws.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was none.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The University Campuses Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rick D. Boulware
Scribe

Attachments:
UCFS Standing Committee members,
T&P Committee and Grievance Committee members,
report and address of Chancellor Duffy report and address of Vice Chancellor Gardner
memoranda from Savannah River Review Committee

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS FOR 1898/1990

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE

Beaufort: Ellen Chamberlain, Gordon Haist, Jane Upshaw
Lancaster: Bruce Nims, Danny Faulkner
Lifelong Learning: Jerry Dockery, John Stine
Salkehatchie: Milton Harden
Sumter: John Logue (Chair), Nancy McDonald, Charles Cook
Union: Tandy Willis

SYSTEM AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Beaufort: Rod Sproatt
Lancaster: John Catalano, Wayne Thurman
Lifelong Learning: Steve Dalton
Salkehatchie: Paul Stone (Chair), Sandra Willis

Sumter: Robert Castleberry, Richard Bell, Sal Macias,
Robert Costello (ex officio) Union: Susan Smith

WELFARE COMMITTEE

Beaufort: John Blair

Lancaster: Wade Chittam, Noni Bohonak

Lifelong Learning: Dave Bowden, Linda Holderfield

Salkehatchie: Susan Moskow

Sumter: Kay Oldhouser, Haas **Raval**, **John** Safford

Union: Mary Barton (Chair)

University Campuses
Tenure and Promotion Committee

USC-Beaufort

Edsel Caine
Joan S. Taylor

USC-Lancaster

Wade Chittam
Wayne Thurman

Lifelong Learning

Dave Bowden
Steve Dalton

USC-Salkehatchie

Larry Strong
Arthur Mitchell

USC-Sumter

John Barrett
John Logue

USC-Union

Betty Martin
Tandy Willis

University Campuses
Grievance Committee

Rod H. Sproatt

Wayne Thurman

Linda Holderfield

Arthur Mitchell

Jean Hatcher

REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SEN'ATE
NOVEMBER 17, 1989
UNION, SC

CHE Action on TEC Proposals

On Thursday, November 2, the CHE accepted the staff recommendation **that the** TEC proposal for college parallel programs at the nine **TEC campuses which did not previously** have the program be approved. Thus, college parallel programs have been approved at Sumter TEC, The Technical College of the Low Country, Denmark TEC, Florence/Darlington TEC, Orangeburg/Calhoun TEC, Spartanburg TEC, Horry/Georgetown TEC, Aiken TEC, and Piedmont TEC.

In its arguments against the proposal, USC charged duplication of effort, lack of evidence that the programs were needed, inadequate consideration on the part of the Commission of the cost of the program to the state, and questioned the need for a community college program in general, given the criticisms of the community college concept which continue to surface nationally.

Dr. Morris of the State TEC Board and Mr. Sheheen based their arguments on access and cost to the student. They argued that the program would open higher education up to minority groups at an affordable price. Commissioner Sheheen eloquently pleaded that students who enrolled in a college parallel program and found they could not do the work, could shift to another program of study without suffering the stigma of failure. Dr. Morris contended that the pool of students whom TEC sought to enroll would be differing from those currently enrolled at USC branches.

USC officials pointed out that the existing college parallel programs in the seven TEC institutions enroll only 14% minority as opposed to 16% for USC campuses. Furthermore according to the Commission's analysis minority enrollment has actually declined over the past year. By contrast, USC-Salkehatchie enrolled 27% minority students in 1988--up from 21% in 1987. The current completion rates for the AA and AS degrees in college parallel programs at the seven TEC campuses is extremely low. A copy of the pertinent statistics is attached to this report. You may make your own judgments and draw your own conclusions as to the validity of the various arguments.

The action noted above, preliminary reaction to our proposals concerning learning centers, and a staff request that we review our University Campuses' missions statements do not bode well for our Campuses. This is not the time for recriminations, panic, striking out on your own, and general malaise, but rather for systematic planning of how best to present our concepts to the University administration, Board, CHE, and the legislature.

Distance Education

After its regular meeting, several members of the CHE and its staff, including Mr. Sheheen, attended a presentation hosted by the Provost on Distance Education and the On-Line Library Catalogue System including the delivery system of the Library Processing Center. Distance Education deals not only with television-assisted instruction but also with Graduate Regional Studies. The programs have existed in the University for 20 years, starting with APOGEE, Engineering, and the MBA program, Business. In addition, the Colleges of Education, Library and Information Science, Social Work, Health, Nursing, and Humanities are all active in this area. Currently, most of the work is at the graduate level but our office of Telecommunications is investigating the possibility of delivering some undergraduate work.

Visit to Louisiana

On November 3, Senator Phil Leventis, Dean Anderson, Dean Lisk, and I visited with officials of LSU-Baton Rouge and LSU-Alexandria to study a limited four-year degree program at Alexandria offered through the auspices of Continuing Education at Baton Rouge.

Budgets and Legislative Matters

Representative Hirsch's committee found its visits to all college campuses in the state to be quite useful and informative. The committee is convinced that every effort should be made to fund the formula. At this point, however, state officials are uncertain about what the economic outlook is for next year because of Hugo and a predicted possible downturn in the national economy.

Dr. Baker's Illness

Dr. Baker has been out ill for more than 2 months. Because of this, the normal salary reports which he routinely does for the Senate have been delayed.

Campus Visits

Our Office hopes to increase the frequency of our campus visits this semester. If funds are available, we plan to renew the bus trips in which we invite Columbia staff and faculty to visit the Campuses to get a first-hand view of what we are about.

Students in General Arts and Sciences

Enrolled in Fall 187 Degrees Awarded 86-87

Total Black

Total Black

Midlands Tech

1,144

295

31

11

York Tech	299	48	
1	0		
Trident Tech	390	59	35 0
Tri-County Tech	568	50	22 1
Williamsburg Tech	55	15	5 1
Chesterfield/Marlboro	142	28	11 0
Greenville Tech	1,275	76	41 3
	3,873	571	146 16

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research. 11/2, 89

Enrolled in Fall 1988 Total Degrees Awarded

	Total	Black	1987-88
Midlands Tech	1,672	391	23
Trident Tech	557	66	0
Tri-County Tech	540	30	17
Williamsburg Tech	77	17	6
Chesterfield/Marlboro	121	30	12
Greenville Tech	1,333	79	0
York Tech	425	5	5
	4,725	618	63

—1 ~—

USC ENROLLMENT

	1987	1988	
Total Black	Total		Black
Beaufort	888	123 (13.85)	1,010 137 (13.56)
Lancaster	1,018	149 (14.63)	1,004 137 (13.64)
Salkehatchie	541	115 (21.25)	628 167 (26.59)
Sumter	1,292	206 (15.94)	1,440 227 (15.6)
Union	319	48 (15.04)	343 58 (16.90)
Totals	4,048	641 (15.83)	4,425 726 (16.41)

—1 ~—

~?~ I~, R s r ~ ~ ,, =~; ~ :. ¢.

- ~- "

Degrees Awarded in General Arts ~ S\.len~es

FY 86-87 FY &,~:

total **Black** **Total** Bla~k

Beaufort	39	6	55	9
Laneaster	g3	10	66	;0
Salkehatchie	51	20	34	::
Sumter	75	14	123	:7
Union	29	5	30	6

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research.

cr

11 -2-89

INFORMAL QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES
 FACULTY SENATE MEETING USC-UNION, November 17, 1989 CHANCELLOR
 DUFFY

Dr. Duffy: We have my report and John's report. John is at the meeting Jim Rex had with the Columbia officials--that's why he's not here. He might be here later. He reports here on the Dean's search at Beaufort, all campus proposals, CHE, etc. Everybody get a chance to read this? Any questions on this that you want to raise at this point?

Professor Upshaw: Dr. Duffy, I'd like to ask what you foresee as the outcome of the meeting today. Is this a substantive meeting that they're going to and can it, in effect, do anything about the CHE vote two weeks ago?

Duffy: You mean, is it a substantive meeting? Yes. The purpose of the meeting, it's an on-going thing. It's a group that Jim Rex put together, I think, when he was Dean of Education at Winthrop. It's basically a public policy group that brings educators and legislators and other interested people together to talk about issues that are of concern to, you know well, the legislators, and as John points out in his thing today, they were going to have Sheheen, Mack Holderfield, Bob Alexander, Dr. Stokes, Bob Stokes, Southern Regional Educational Board, and others. You know, it's just a forum; it's not a legislative body by any shot. You want me to fill you in on what's going on?

All right. Essentially, the Tech proposal passed the Commission. It was recommended to the Commission by the staff and they bought it. The staff report is interesting; I wish I'd had it about a month before I got hold of it, and my report deals with it a little bit. The staff report could be used to boast almost any position. The most striking thing to me was that this was a program, a program which was sold on the grounds that it would increase minority enrollments, that it would, you know, offer access to those who might not otherwise have access, and it was just beautiful, and I frankly had tears in my eyes as I listened to Morrison and Sheheen. I asked questions that frankly they have not bothered to answer. I have the answers in the notes I gave you, and that is, that this program has been in effect for seven years. I think it is a legitimate question to ask, then, in its seven years of operation, has it increased significantly the number of minorities going to college? And the answer, I think -- I said you could draw your own conclusions --obviously I have drawn my conclusions. Since 1987, at Tech, 299 students enrolled in this program, 48 of them were black, and there was one

graduate. This really shows me the tremendous demand for this program in the state at large. Williamsburg Tech, in 1987 -- Williamsburg I might add is primarily minority here -- it must be 70% black population -

Williamsburg Tech had 55 students enrolled in this program, 15 of them from minority, 5 graduates, and one minority graduate.

Now I understand why there are no takers for the degree. I understand that quite well. We have the same problem in our own associate degrees. Those degrees don't mean anything to students who are enrolled in a baccalaureate program, who think of themselves as in a baccalaureate program. The degree does mean something, and I historically support it, to certain students -- to military, for example, because it sort of punches one of their cards to have an associate degree. And some adults, who feel the need to have some kind of marker that they can point to. In continuing ed for years, we've recognized that need for the 30-hour certificates, and whatever. So I'm not surprised at that. What does surprise me is the very low incidence of minorities in their enrollments and this is borne out in the CHE study. Tech actually has 14% minority enrollments in these programs. If you look closer at the statistics, you'd find out that if it weren't for Midlands Tech and Trident Tech, that 14% would be significantly lower -- Midlands Tech and Trident Tech apparently. Greenville Tech: 76 blacks out of 1275 students enrolled. Now, that contrasts with our campuses, I think, yeah, Beaufort in 1987, you know, I'm a little bit more at ease with the 1987 figures, I must add -- although you swear by the 1988 figures, or on your soul...eh? All right. Let me tell you that when these figures came to me, they were so bad in terms of what Tech was talking about that I could not believe them, and I had them checked, double checked, and triple checked. I would have at least got a gun out and made some people sign up for these associate degrees myself. Lancaster had 14.63%, Salkehatchie 21.25%, Sumter 15.9 -- of course, our minority enrollments are much better than the average, except on one campus, and that's Beaufort, and there it's right on the average if you round out. The 1988 figures telling in fact. This study, that the upon, points out that their enrollments . You know, it's a ridiculous kind of thing made, nothing, no needs assessments were Mr. Sheheen got up and rather eloquently spoke to the human side of the equation: how a student admitted, say to one of our campuses, and obviously to the University of South Carolina, or to a four-year college, who doesn't quite cut it for one reason or another, and then because they have to drop out and go to another institution; whereas, if they're in the same institution, the student can drop out of that program and move into another program and not feel the stigma of failure. And frankly, I felt like, God, I've been transported back into about 1965-75, where we're dealing with high school...where the students should not feel the stigma of failure. If a student fails, per chance, at the academic side, then we put them into something else -- basket-weaving or something else -- and at the end of four years, the unstigmatized student emerges with a high

are even more __ Commission acted dropped (Tech's) that no case is taken, and then school diploma and absolutely nothing else...which you know I was almost tearful when I heard that.

We're all...we got beat on this issue. We got beat because they sold it as an access issue and a lot of people were sold on the access issue. The evidence that it was not an access issue didn't come up with them until later. We got beat purely because we got out-manuevered. Tech spent a good portion of more than a year selling this thing, over and over again, repeating. We got ourselves manuevered in this situation. We would seem to be

selfishly defending turf, opposing motherhood, and opposing ideas that are quite, you know, quintessential in a democratic society. We have, in my opinion, a series of proposals before Tech -- well not before Tech -- before the Commission, and we now have the fob of going out and selling those things over the next year, in the same way that Tech did. In the end, I mean, we have, we can't just sit back and say we're going to wait on Columbia to sell our...we're going to wait on John Duffy to sell that, or anybody else. You've got to sell it. Regardless, you've got to get in there and sell those things, basically.

The cost situation: the cost to Tech. You know, one of the arguments is that Tech students only pay \$600 -- that kind of stuff. Sure, they only pay \$600. If we were funded in the same way, our students would only pay \$600. Automatically, the way the formula works, deduct 20% on the assumption that that's what we're going to collect in tuition; whereas in the case of Tech, they deduct only what is actually collected. And Tech will also turn around and say, now, we don't get funding for, you know, buildings--for maintenance. That is not true. They do. For instance, in Beaufort, and they get it at Denmark Tec. They don't get it at the other campuses because there's a specified amount of money that the county councils put up for that purpose. In the case of Beaufort, they get the same. You say, why don't we point to the argument that Lowcountry Technical College gets about twice as much in FTE as Beaufort. Immediately, Fred will turn to you and say, as he did, in fact, it's pretty ridiculous to argue, to try to argue, these cost figures in front of a group--say, any group--because all they have to do is assert. I can get up and scream, yell loud enough that the cost is the same; they will argue that the cost is cheaper...and the costs are the same basically. A freshman student costs about as much, because of the formula, the way the formula operates, a freshman student taking English, math, foreign language, history, and science, is going to cost as much here as it does at Tech, or, for that matter, with some slight differential, because of the physical plant and all, the same as at Columbia. The academic--what's cranked up by the formula for the instructional thing--would be the same. So, that's what we got beat on. There is some possibility that the legislature might act on it or that there might be some act in the legislature. There seems to be a growing feeling that, certainly in the case of Beaufort and Sumter, the thing doesn't make too much sense. I've been asked, the Board wants us to prepare something for them on the issue, the State newspaper wants something on this issue. It's hardly dead issue at this point. But, on the other hand, you realize that the Commission's action should be final under the law. Of course, the legislature could get into the act anytime it wanted to, and, that's basically where we are. In terms of those proposals that we have to the Commission, they won't be acted on until next April. There was an attempt to act on the Aiken/Beaufort, Beaufort/Aiken/Sumter things yesterday, but it was beaten down, and frankly, we need the time to develop our position papers, and all that. But, frankly, I don't think that those things are going to get through by some immaculate conception: we have to get out and work for them. And we have to be rational about it. Can't get up and scream and call them names and all that. We basically have to make a case for what we are doing, and this business of just sitting back and automatically reacting negatively against the Commission is not going to work. The Commission has certain powers, granted by the legislature, and we may as well face up to that. And I know I'm right with that because I've said that to Columbia, and I say it now.

Professor Sproatt: You said that the vote on the proposals for Aiken and Beaufort were beaten back?

Duffy: They decided they didn't have enough information...the Commission had come...the Commission staff had come up with a proposal in the case of Aiken to Sumter. They wanted

those things phased out by '91, and then they wanted Columbia to offer those courses in Sumter with a step¹² kick to Columbia to do it. Why? I have no idea. I have suspicions, but I don't want to deal with that. But, you know what I mean, it doesn't make much sense. In the case of Beaufort, they came up with one that I thought was absolutely marvelous and that is that that one be done, that we do away with by '90, and we meet your needs for distance education, with telecommunications, GRS television mode. You know we've been thinking along those lines, that that is a possible solution to this problem. But to be honest with you, we figured it would take three years to get that one off the ground. Where's Susan [Bridwell]? Is Susan there? Isn't that what we figured? At least three years? (Bridwell: Maybe two.) OK, maybe two. But still that's one we would need time.

Sproatt: That would include education, because by state law, and things I'm sure you're familiar with, in order to be able to award a teaching certificate, you have to have graduated from an approved program; so that would mean that you would become an approved program for teacher education?

Duffy: You're right. We can't do it in teacher education from Columbia.

Sproatt: Right.

Duffy: We could conceivably do it from Aiken, conceivably do it from Coastal, and we will go along with the Coastal thing anyway. Apparently the Sumter students have to go to Coastal for a block of courses taken in the fall of what is their senior year, and we've already looked in--I've looked in--we are very seriously examining the possibility of offering that block in a telecommunications mode--which is not straight television. It involves, you know, visits, television systems instruction.

Sproatt: Since the students that we have in Beaufort find it very difficult to travel--the access argument that Tech made is right on the mark for our students, in that, as I've told a couple of people here, we have more student teachers in the Aiken program in Beaufort than they do in Aiken.

Duffy: Well, let's not point it out. The access, yeah, right on target. The access argument that Tech used is the access argument that we can use, only our figures, I think, are better in terms of what's happened with where we've created these things. And we have to prove that to somebody besides ourselves. We sit around and say how great we are and what we're doing. We've got to prove that to some external judges, in this instance, the Commission on Higher Education, the members of the Commission. And we haven't done that. And we're gonna do it, and if we don't do it, we're going to be out of business.

Unidentified Senator: I was wondering about the legislative support for us on the issues that recently passed the Commission, and we understand that there were three letters in our favor and forty-seven on the other side?

Duffy: Yeah. Representative Herb Kirsch, who is the chair of the subcommittee on the budget. On the budget. You know the budget committee. The House Committee -- Appropriation Committee -- has a subcommittee, and it deals with higher education budgets. Therefore, it deals with our budgets and deals with the Tech commissions budgets, and the chairman of that committee and his two members, two subcommittee members, there are three of them, were

concerned, were expressing a concern, about this particular move, etc., so he wrote asking that they defer, to stop it. Not stopping it--but that they give it some thought of what the cost might be. And then Waddell's Finance Committee wrote out saying--didn't necessarily oppose it--but they wanted to know all about it. And Peden McLeod had written one some time before, and then it was pretty obviously what happened. All the letters were dated the same day, and some of them were quite good. The one that David Beasley did was quite good, had obviously been thought out. But some of the things I had a hard time figuring out whether they were for or against. One, for instance, said the program worked so good in the Midlands, he hated to see anything done to it. Well, nobody's threatened what's happening in the Midlands. It may backfire; it was a cute move. What they were able to do was to take Kirsch's letter and Waddell's letter and bury them into the middle of these things--which is fine in games, and one might say that you've scored a point--but I suspect that it might make some people mad.

Unidentified Senator: Are those letters available?

Duffy: Yeah. They're in my office. I thought we mailed them. We didn't mail them? Well, they're there; you can have them. We also have computer printout.

Questioner: Copies?

Duffy: Yeah, sure. I thought we had done that.

Questioner: You could have. I have so much paper work flowing just now, that it could have been...

Duffy: I **sent** copies of letters that came from people in their areas whom we had always thought of as being tremendous supporters.

Upshaw: Dr. Duffy, in the Commission meeting, they were quoting approximately \$10 million that this program would cost over the next three years. I think it's 2.7, 2.9, and 3.2. My question is: Is that money already appropriated through the cutting edge, or is it already appropriated as some package, or does the legislature have to appropriate that to implement this program?

Duffy: Well, what Tech said, in effect, was that that money is already there. For the shot, the opening gun, that they've already got the money, that they don't need any additional money. That they can find their own internal reallocation -- and they can do this -- it's only \$3 million on a budget of \$200 million is not that much money to move around. Then in terms of what it will cost in the future, Commissioner Sheheen has pointed out that the cost is simply related to the formula and that the formula would generate these dollars whether they go to Beaufort or to Lowcountry Tech. So, in that sense, it wouldn't cost the State that much. But you know, like the library question, which is, we've got this library set up that, over the years, is quite good. Will not only support the undergraduates but will support some which have graduate degrees. The Commissioner can't see why that can't be used to support Tech, the same way it's being used to support our campuses. In fact, he's as much as said that with the question of Aiken. We all have these arrangements. Everybody has, except Aiken, for some reason. So Aiken was not able to argue that they had this sign-off agreement. So, Aiken ended up by not having, by any stretch of the imagination, enough books, or access to books, to pay for it, and that was brought out. It was pointed out that the Chancellor at Aiken said he wasn't going to

let them use the library anyway, and Fred [Sheheen] said, well, he'd see about that. You know, it's going to be pretty tough to be in a position to be justified in saying...how about looking in your newspaper and they've got your Dean or Chancellor saying, "I'm sorry, but we can't let those people down the street use our books." Our books have been paid for by the State is the way people look at it.

Professor Chamberlain: Dr. Duffy, however, on Hilton Head, where we're going into the same facility with Tech and Tech is going to use our library services, our staff, and our interlibrary loan, and if Fred Sheheen says that. Now, I've completed a memo for Dean Bashaw trying to list all the expenses that I could think of that we would incur by offering library services on Hilton Head, and it came to a sizable amount. And it seems to me that if we're sharing the same facilities with Tech people, it seems to me that we should be splitting the cost of the library service down the middle...because they would come right into the library, use the services, and they wouldn't pay for them unless we had some kind of agreement up front. We couldn't keep them from using them. So it would behoove us to sign an agreement with them in advance, saying it's going to cost you so much annually in order to use the library. Now I understand that Fred Sheheen says no way...the Tech people are allowed to use the University library facilities for nothing. And if that's the case, the people who pay to send their family members to the University of South Carolina are literally supporting the Tech people, as well, by supplying this service.

Duffy: I have reservations. I don't have knowledge of Fred saying anything to that extent, and I'm certainly going to ask him...certainly not officially.

Chamberlain: Are you saying, then, that it's OK for us to cut a deal with the Tech people and get them to pay up front?

Duffy: Well, you know, something like that would have to be negotiated, but I've not heard anything like this. Not heard that. I'd like to know what the source of it is. Who said that? Fred said that?

Chamberlain: I **heard it came through you.**

Duffy: From me? I'm **aware of the fact that** he thinks that we can support what we're doing with this infrastructure. I hadn't said that he had said anything specifically.

Professor Caine: It came from the coordinator of the military programs.

Duffy: Then he heard it straight from the lips of Fred? OK. One point is, I think, that we would be well advised to do what most of us have been trained to do: to check our sources, to validate our information. And you know, I think I might know what you're talking about; I think I might know where he might be coming from on that. I don't blame him; if I were in his position, I would be too. In fact, in my position, I am, too. But I think we have to deal with what we're actually dealing with, not with what we anticipate. There's a lot of anticipation going on and a lot of philosophizing that's going to get in the damn way of working this thing through, to be honest with you. I can't be any more candid than that. There's a lot of counterproductive crap going on.

Sproatt: In that same category,...

Duffy: Crap category?

Sproatt: I mean, if we can talk practically here, I think if you would talk to various people in this room, we all have heard various horror stories, scenarios, and so forth, and a big concern since this has been going on for at least a year that the University's been aware of, there seemingly hasn't been a great effort to stop this, at least not until the eleventh inning, and there's this creeping paranoia that there's this grand plan that the University has to set up and trade us for a super computer or the top 100, or whatever, and I -- could you address that?

Duffy: Yeah. Very clearly. I'll address it. I wish we did have a plan. In fact, what I'm suggesting that we need a plan. I'm suggesting that we need a plan. One way or the other -- there's David Bell. Haven't I said this, David, rather openly and publicly?

David Bell: Certainly have.

Duffy: ...and this **instance**, it's not a plan, but a lack of a plan. There are a lot of people that feel that we ought not be combative...that we should have people from outside, external people. For instance, if you went up to the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, they know that there are three institutions in the State that they know about: Clemson, USC and Tech. 'Cause that's all they got. And they can't see why the University of South Carolina, Columbia, should be concerned about the University of South Carolina, Spartanburg, University of South Carolina, Beaufort. And you know, there is that kind of thinking, and it's understandable. And certainly there are people in Columbia that want to downscale the University...that **would buy** off on the concept of the three-tiered system of higher education...people perfectly happy with it and wish all of you'd go away. I mean there's people like that.

Sproatt: "Are those people top administration?" is what we're asking.

Duffy: No. I don't think so. I really don't. Top administration, I think, is still committed to the System. Only, top administration is asking some questions that I think should be asked, and trying to deal with some of the tensions that exist. We were talking about this earlier today. Some of the people that talk system have been doing so for years, but they don't mean system. Once their office begins to get goosed, they begin to get all excited and they argue. I've got one campus, and you wouldn't believe the nonsense that comes out of that place. And it's not Columbia, in terms of what they want by way of quality and all that. And quality doesn't exist except there. In fact, that particular campus questioned faculty members who had been approved by Columbia departments. But I'm not aware of any trade-off. I am aware of the fact that the Commission talks about that sort of thing. When you're dealing with somebody like Fred Sheheen, you're not dealing with somebody who was born yesterday. You're dealing with a guy with a record that's twenty-odd years old. That hasn't changed. I'm reminded John Martin once said of Woodrow Wilson: Woodrow Wilson was a brilliant man. Trouble is he hasn't had a damn idea since he graduated from college, and that was thirty years ago. And there are people like that. Single-minded devotion in spite of everything. That is evidenced by the Commission. He [Sheheen] knows what he wants to do; you know what he wants to do; I know what he wants to do.

Sproatt: Well, along those same lines, then if they are trying to fix it where we can't, or have a difficult time, distinguishing ourselves, are they going to bite these distant learning concepts, the concept of a learning center on this campus so that we can provide access...

Duffy: No plans to my knowledge. The distant learner concept and all that kind of thing -- relatively new for the Commission. It's been around for years, but it's relatively new.

Sproatt: Seems like they're holding us here, so we can't distinguish ourselves...

Duffy: That's a possibility. I see that as a possibility. No, I really do, and I understand the problem on that.

Questioner: I had a question on the distant education and the Coastal/Sumter educational services -- said you'd investigated that seriously? Were you also looking into seriously retaining the program as it now exists?

Duffy: I'm sorry. What do you mean?

Questioner: Well, you talked about substituting one for another; what about just continuing the program as it now exists? What is needed to allow that?

Duffy: The distance learner stuff won't work unless we can continue to teach some of those courses that we have been teaching. We can't do all that by television. But I understand your question. We aren't. We try to cover that base too. You know, there's a scenario -- I don't want to get everybody paranoid -- for instance, they could simply say, well, we're not going to give credit, we're not going to give FTE for the 300 work at the campuses because they give only 100 and 200. And they could also get you on the other hand and say well, we're also not going to give if University Campuses insist on separating themselves from Tech...money for the so-called remedial...that's a possibility. You know, the only reason I hesitate to talk about it is that I'm not sure all this has occurred to them yet, but they're all possibilities, possible scenarios. But the only thing I'm suggesting is that rather than sitting around and stewing over these possible scenarios is to start basically to cover ourselves. One is, we need to show someone other than ourselves, our wives, our spouses, our children, and our pet dog, who believes everything we say, that what we're doing is important. It's essential, and we do a better job of it than anybody else. We've got to do that. Defending this program that we've got to the Commissioners and the legislators is the way to do it -- not just sitting around steaming about Fred. And we talk about the Commission as if it existed out in space somewhere. We never have worked with the Commission the way we work with the Legislature, and we need to do that. And they're pretty rational people; they listen to arguments; they have no, as far as I know, they have no particular reason to be opposed to the concept we're trying to sell.

Questioner: You've practically answered my question. A lot of discussion now on where and how to focus our efforts. Many people have begun these kinds of things but, obviously on the one hand, we need to think about the Commission and our upcoming off-campus and cooperative four-year programs. But as you said, the parallel college program issue is not a dead one. Just wondered about your thoughts on how we might proceed on an issue that has already been settled, but has not been settled. Obviously that's the focus on the Legislature at this point. It's in the Legislature's arena now, right?

Duffy: Not necessarily.

Questioner: No?

Duffy: I mean, it's probably ...that's the way it looks like....there may be some activity. No, I think, when you have a legislative delegation that's so totally opposed to the thing, that they probably could exert some pressure on the local tec center. Beaufort: seems to me there is a pressure point there. I think, for instance, it was reported, it was in the PACKET, that all of a sudden, people pushing a consortium on Hilton Head, realized that what they might have ended up with this Lowcountry Tech thing was what they did not want, and that's only the first two years. They didn't want that. I mean the local people, the people that vote. One of the things we ran into in talking with certain Commission members was the question of access--they honest to God bought off on the idea of access. That this is access. When the statistics indicate that this is not access. I mean this is a trick; this is something they've been doing to minorities for 25 years, and it's ...give them access to what? You know, let them into community colleges, teach them computers, or teach them any number of things. Only they can't get jobs. When they get to the outside, they haven't been taught anything. So they go back, grab another ring and take another course. I know you're going to be shocked that when Ronald Reagan was governor of California had a report done that basically indicted the community college system in California...said it was not an educational system; it was a welfare system. I think all that needs to be pointed out, and you have to be very careful because, let's face it, the people of South Carolina are very proud of certain things. And they are proud because they've been told that these things are great. And one of the things is their state tech system. Their tech system in terms of meeting the needs for jobs over the '60's and '70's did a fantastic job - no question about that. So don't attack tech schools; talk about community colleges. That's my strategy.

Questioner: Is the University prepared to commit staff and money to the success of a public relations effort to get across the message to the State that the University Campuses are going to do the job, or are you just suggesting that we should lobby the legislators?

Duffy: You mean go into a full-scale PR campaign?

Questioner: I mean a full-scale campaign like Tech has been doing for some time.

Duffy: I don't think so. I mean, I don't know; nobody's asked me. How do I feel personally about those things? I think if you've got to hire a PR agent to make the point, we probably shouldn't be in the business. I know what you're saying. I hired someone a couple of years ago from Tech, hired at another campus, and was put on a committee to work with me, and we talked. At the first meeting, this person's first suggestion, right out of the box, was to hire a PR firm! Frankly, maybe it's the way to do it. But I happen to come out of a more conservative school of thought that doesn't believe the University needs to hire a PR firm.

Caine: Do you think there are other options that will work?

Duffy: No, not necessarily.

Caine: We've lost students.

Duffy: You lost on this one issue.

Caine: We lost the class suit before the Tech board, or least before the CHE.

Duffy: Yeah, but it wasn't a PR firm that sold those commissioners .

Caine: It could have made a difference if there had been a public sentiment that we were doing a good job and that we were providing access. The lack of public sentiment is what got us into trouble and what caused that was the lack of public relations.

Duffy: I don't think it's public sentiment or public relations in that sense.

Caine: Public perception.

Duffy: Yeah, well, your opinion on this is as good as mine, which is, and neither one of us is worth a damn...(laughter)...but I'm not sure the kind of effort I was thinking should be done by individuals working rather than a slick PR firm. But maybe you're right. Maybe we need that. That's something to think about.

Upshaw: Dr. Duffy, I think we feel, all of us, some sense of competition in this matter. My husband called me yesterday morning before 8:00 and said, "I just want you to know that Technical College of the Lowcountry not only has a billboard and not only is putting half-page ads in the ISLAND PACKET and not only putting radio ads all over the radio, but now they're putting television ads on the television." And I think that people who are already educated, there's no question about where they want their child to go to school. I had a teacher tell me, whose child didn't make it at Ohio State and she came to USCB this year, "I can't tell you how pleased we are with what she's doing and what she's learning and the whole educational atmosphere there." But this is an educated person already, and I think our concern is, in this competitive situation, we want to get people who don't know our story, as well as other people.

Unidentified Speaker: There's where the PR can help, cause in 15 seconds of saying exactly that on 12 television stations across the state at the 11:00 local news could turn the whole institution around.

Upshaw: And nobody, in my opinion, is saying that that alone will answer the problem. I think all of us recognize that and that we have to put our very best foot forward in this situation. We should have been doing it already. Then, maybe if we had been doing it already, this would'nt have happened to us in the first place. But we haven't, and we have to do that. But I think we would also like to have a united, concerted effort on all fronts that answers this competitive situation that we are in.

Duffy: Well, I mean I'm not absolutely opposed to -- it's just that -- I don't know. I will raise the issue. I still think that one article that is generated on the news side of the House, as opposed to an advertisement, might take the...the article on the news side. I have seen the full-page ads, which are rather garish, particularly in the evening edition. Now they may have a PR firm. Some of it may be overkill, but, I mean, it's an interesting point. It'll be interesting to see what happens, particularly down there [Beaufort].

Unidentified Questioner: Would the University Campuses eventually no longer be associated with the University?

Duffy: That's a possibility. You ask the question, I mean, what I'm asking you is how are you going to distinguish what you're doing? How are you going to differentiate what you're doing? Let's say, we need to get a PR firm. Where and how's the PR firm going to tell us how we're different?

Sproatt: That depends **on the** resources.

Duffy: The only resources you can possibly expect are the resources generated by the formula, because Columbia has no more than you do.

Chamberlain: Well **we've thought** about this, **and we've talked** about it in different ways, and one of the ways we would distinguish ourselves is to move into the area of offering more upper-level courses and providing access to baccalaureate degrees that the Tech system says they're doing by starting students out. And I asked this question earlier today, and I know there's an answer, but I'd like to ask it again, and that is, that we bought into this plan of being reaccredited as a System and being reaccredited as a level-two institution. I think it would be a tremendous opportunity for us. Many of us embraced it with a great deal of anticipation and excitement, because it did mean a great deal of opening up a lot of doors, that we could see opportunities grow and expand, and really fulfill our missions and meet the needs of our constituents. I think we see that as an opportunity to co-exist with Tech schools as they begin to offer associate degrees. My question is, how's the CHE going to react to this when they realize -- or maybe they already have, although they haven't indicated so -- when we have this level two-to-four institution re-accreditation? We will no longer be level one institutions; we won't be two-year campuses; we're not really now.

Duffy: We don't exist up there. We better get this through our heads and that is, whether we like it or not, by legislation, the CHE has certain amounts of authority, and one of the things is, we did, a couple of years ago, we anticipated it. We knew that we had more than 20, more than 50% of the course offerings at these various campuses, and we put together this tremendous package, which is now going to the Commission, and it will then be followed by a package which relates to Applied Professional Sciences. But you can't just say, here I am, a full-blown learning center; you have to prove it. You've got to convince those people it's worth doing. You've got to convince your own faculty it's worth doing. You've got to convince Columbia faculty it's worth doing. Before the Commission, you've got to do the same job.

Chamberlain: I agree, and I think that's the fight we're fighting for right now. I don't think we gain anything by being negative and turn back the clock and tell Tech they can't have that. Now, maybe the Legislature will see through that, but I would rather concentrate our efforts on trying to get the next package through CHE and starting out a fight for that, getting those off-campus programs approved.

Duffy: We don't disagree. We've beaten the CHE on several occasions, as a University. We can't go through life doing that. The CHE has certain statutes that give the Commission certain authority. We just can't sit around thumbing our noses at it. We have to sell what we're doing to the Commission. We can't go over to the legislature and say, "Help us. Those bad

guys are beating up on us again," because ultimately the Legislature is going to get tired of this. You and I are in total agreement. You have a plan; you have all these proposals in front of the Commission.

Chamberlain: That's right, and they're important because they are our future.

Duffy: I'm not sure that we can't work out...I mean there's a lot of sympathy for Sumter and Beaufort on this issue of duplication, but then, getting back to the other point, we're perfectly willing to listen.

Chamberlain: My next question is, can we count on Columbia to support us in this, from the very beginning and right on through?

Duffy: What are you talking about, "Columbia?" Columbia supported you on the other one. I can't speak for the President. What is Columbia? If you're talking about a state-wide effort that involves the System, yes.

Chamberlain: I want to coordinate all our efforts.

Duffy: I would be disappointed if that **were** not the case.

REPORT OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
NOVEMBER 17, 1989
UNION, SC

The Chancellor has requested that I attend a 10:00 a.m. meeting on November 17 in Columbia, the state education policy seminar. The subject of this meeting is the recent action by CHE for altering the degree-granting status of the nine technical colleges. The organizers of this seminar have invited Commissioner Sheheen, Dr. Holderfield (Chancellor Duffy's counterpart at TEC), Bob Alexander of USC-Aiken (USC representative), and Robert Stokes of the Southern Regional Education Board to address the seminar. These seminars are attended by legislators and policy makers and are designed to provide indepth discussions of current issues. I am hopeful that this will be completed in time for me to join you for your 2:00 p.m. general session.

Status of USC-Beaufort Dean Search

The Chancellor has appointed an outstanding search committee which has met once to determine its procedures and timetable. I am chairing this committee and I took the opportunity a. our first meeting to also meet with interested members of the Beaufort family faculty/staff to discuss with them search procedures. We currently have underway a national advertising campaign to solicit applications and they are rolling in daily. We should be able to assemble an outstanding pool of applicants.

Sometime in February we will start the process of bringing applicants to the campus for interviews and to meet all interested faculty and staff. I will keep you posted.

University Campuses Off-Campus Program Proposals to CHE

The off-campus programs we have been operating for many years are currently being reviewed by the Commission on Higher Education. These proposals reached the Commission on November 1 and will be in their cycle to be acted upon at the May 2, 1990 meeting. Chancellor Duffy and/or I will comment verbally at the Senate meeting on preliminary verbal responses from the Commission to Provost Smith on these. We're talking here about the status of the proposals involving USC-Union at Laurens, USC-Beaufort at Hilton Head, USC-Lancaster at Camden, USC-Salkehatchie at Walterboro, Aiken business programs at Sumter and Beaufort, Coastal education program at Sumter, and Aiken education programs at Salkehatchie and Beaufort.

System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee

The Committee will have had its second meeting of the year on November 16. Due to the length of time it takes to prepare this report prior to our meeting on the 17th, I will not be able to include a written report of the **activities** of that meeting. However, you **are represented at that meeting** by your Senate Chair, Professor Cureton. I **believe she can handle this** very well for both of us. The items we will have been discussing are as follows.

Campus representatives will be asked to report on the progress they have made toward full implementation of the policy recommended by the Committee to President Holderman and approved by him in spring 1989, pertaining to the right of an undergraduate student to complete graduate requirements under the Bulletin that was in effect at the time he or she first entered the USC System in matriculated status.

Undergraduate students are now allowed up to five years of continuous absence within the eight years they have to complete the requirements for their degrees, while claiming the right to graduate under the Bulletin in effect at the time they first entered the USC system in matriculated status. The question is whether this five-year allowance should be modified.

Should the University of South Carolina System continue to maintain a single grading system for all undergraduate programs? If so, by what process might changes in the grading system be made?"

In lieu of the fact that we do not have a System faculty senate this committee takes on extremely important significance to address future System academic articulation issues.

Affirmative Action Officer Search

I chaired a search committee for a number of months which has recently recommended three finalists to the President for his review and selection. We hope to have this matter completed prior to the Christmas holidays and I am optimistic that we will have a new outstanding Affirmative Action Officer to replace the very capable Paula Cox who left us in July to join her husband's move to Rice University in Texas.

Faculty Development Seminar

As part of the CHE-sponsored University Instructional Development Project to enhance the training of graduate teaching assistants at USC-Columbia (this project is jointly administered by John Gardner, George Reeves, and Mike Welsh), we are bring in a faculty development expert to speak to interested faculty. You are, **therefore, invited to attend this on** December ~ at 2:30 p.m. in **Gambrell Hall, Room 153. Our speaker will** be Robert M. Diamond, **Assistant Vice Chancellor for Instructional** Development and Director of the Center for Instructional Development, Syracuse University. The title of his address will be "Teaching, Research, Rhetoric, and Reality." This address is also being sponsored by **the Office of the Provost and will be followed** by a reception.

Diamond holds an A.B. in economics from Union College and an M.A. and Ph.D. in Education from New York University. His major **professional focus** has been on the systematic improvement of instruction in higher education. He has directed course and curriculum design, implementation, and evaluation programs at San Jose State University, the University of Miami, and Syracuse University. A Senior Fulbright Lecturer to India in 1976, he was selected as a **distinguished faculty** member for the State University of New York Scholar Exchange Program in 1969. Diamond has written extensively in the area of curriculum design and instructional development. His most recent book is a 1989 Jossey-Bass publication entitled *Designing and Improving Courses and Curricula in Higher Education*.

In addition to his work in instructional improvement, Diamond has developed and implemented a model program of TA training on the Syracuse campus. In 1987, Diamond and Peter Gray co-authored a National Study on Teaching Assistants. In September of this year, the national study instrument was used at USC to survey graduate TAs about their teaching responsibilities, preparation, and perceived needs. While on the USC-Columbia campus, Diamond will meet with the Advisory Board to the

University's grant-funded TA training project and will present the results of the TA survey to graduate directors, deans, and department chairpersons.

January University 101 Faculty Training Workshop

This is to ask you to invite any of your new colleagues or perhaps not-so-new colleagues who have not yet been through the University 101 faculty training to do so. The next workshop will be held January 2-5, 1990 at USC-Columbia. This office will cover travel and subsistence costs.

Proposed Tuition Assistance Plan for Faculty/Staff

As has been discussed previously with this group, the University is presently designing a proposal to send to the State Human Resources Division for approval--a proposal which would provide University support for college tuition for University faculty/staff to take job-related courses. It would permit them to take one course per term. The proposal is now in the President's Office for final review before forwarding to the state level. We will keep you informed as to how it fares. System Vice President Jameson and her staff deserve much credit for keeping this important concept alive and moving it forward!

Proposal for Reciprocal Tuition Agreement with Contiguous Georgia Counties

As some of you may be aware, the state of Georgia for some time has permitted South Carolina/Alabama/Florida residents whose counties border on the state of Georgia to attend Georgia state institutions and pay in-state fees. This has had some impact on USC-Aiken, USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Beaufort. Currently, our legislative liaison personnel are discussing with legislative budget writers the possibility of introducing a proviso in the next session of the General Assembly that would permit also South Carolina state institutions to offer such reciprocal tuition agreements. Obviously, this could impact favorably on several of the University Campuses. We will keep you informed.

Faculty Exchange Deadline

This is to remind you that the Faculty Exchange deadline is November 17. For those of you who were not aware of this if you would contact me, I believe I can arrange an extension. We do want University Campuses faculty to pursue this opportunity.

October Report of Columbia Faculty Senate Welfare Committee

This is to call your attention to a recent report of the USC-Columbia Faculty Senate Welfare Committee on which the University Campuses are represented. Specifically, as a part of that report, the committee recommended that the University and Four-Year Campuses should not be permitted to alter or expand their missions and/or to engage in what was described as "empire building." Naturally, such language is of concern to this office and we would be pleased to have the Senate clarify with its representative what lead to this recommendation and what can be done to inform the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee so that they will cease to see us as a drain on Columbia resources.

System Retreat for Business, Computing and Personnel Officers

The Office of the Chancellor is working with the System offices for personnel, computer services, and business and finance, to organize a retreat for December 1-3 to bring together many of the campus-based personnel in these three critical areas for the first time. The purpose of this meeting will be to bring together from all nine campuses not only the chief business/computing/personnel office but as many of the support staff as possible who are essential to the effective delivery of critical support functions; to meet needs for increased efforts to network; share information and technology; increase collegiality, as well as have opportunities for open-ended network sharing, problem-solving discussion; to listen to non-Columbia personnel's many useful views and opinions on problems, challenges and opportunities; and to generate agendas for future discussion of issues and problems and provide System-level university officers valuable input into the planning and development of future policies. We are extremely optimistic that this will be a useful meeting that will bring positive results to the five University Campuses.

Hurricane Hugo Budget Impact

To state it quite simply, all of you who read the South Carolina press reports as to the economic impact of Hurricane Hugo probably know as much about its potential impact on state government-funded **activities** as does the Chancellor and/or I. I assume you have all read in The State newspaper about the latest economic forecast being given to the State Budget and Control Board to the effect that the state's economy is projected to grow at a 6% annual growth rate for the 1990-91 fiscal year with an anticipated additional new state revenues, in spite of Hurricane Hugo, of some \$170,000,000. As for how that will be sliced up for higher education vis a vis other agencies we, of course, cannot tell you. But we do know that we have a number of supporters in the General Assembly who are doing their best to increase the extent of formula funding for us for the coming year. In the meantime, it remains very unclear as to what the impact of Hurricane Hugo will be on this year's state budget. There have been rumors of the possibility of mid-year budget cuts and an indication that there have been some differences of opinion in the General Assembly as to whether it should ask state agencies to take budget cuts before going into the State Reserve Fund. Again, no official information has been provided on this and we do not wish in any way to contribute to pointless speculation or rumoring at this time. We regret that we cannot be more informative to you about this matter at this time.

Study of Feasibility of System Adult Learner Interdisciplinary Degree

As you know, we have, thanks to the College of Applied Professional Sciences, been able to offer for many years the Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies degree to all of our five campuses. Without that, we would have no mechanism for the true adult learner to fulfill baccalaureate-level aspirations. In light, however, of the recent CHE opposition to what the University Campuses stand for, there is some feeling that we need to go on the offensive to further differentiate our mission from those of the state's technical colleges. One way to do this might be to create our own System adult learner degree which we could offer in addition to the BAIS. The Chancellor's office has asked the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to consider appointing a faculty committee or using one of the standing committees to consider the feasibility of such a degree for the University Campuses. The idea is not necessarily to reinvent the wheel but to make a survey of possible models currently existing elsewhere in American higher education and then to determine how they might be adapted appropriately to our University Campuses needs. If we should develop a proposal that were to be approved by our Senate, naturally, it would need then to go to the USC-Columbia Curricula and Courses Committee and then on to the USC-Columbia Senate, Administration, and Board, and then finally to CHE for review and approval. So at the very best, this is a long,

time-consuming process indeed. In the meantime, we are extremely fortunate to have the BAIS which, incidentally, must be submitted to CHE for review and in all probability will enter their May 1990 cycle for action upon by the Commission in November of 1990. The University has submitted a letter of intent to submit this program for review because the Commission has requested this and at present Richard Mims, Don Stowe, and I are working on a draft proposal for informal review by CHE officers.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S.C. 29208

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Swearingen Engineering Center Office of the Dean

MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Senate
From: E. G. Schwartz ~
Chairman, Savannah River Review Committee
Subject: Annual Report

April 24, 1989

This committee was formed by action of the Faculty Senate at its meeting of June 16, 1988. It was subsequently expanded by action of the Steering Committee to include a member elected by the Aiken Campus Faculty and a member elected by the Two Year Faculty Senate. The purpose of the committee is to review the relationship between the University and the new contractor at the Savannah River Site. That relationship was to be conducted through a consortium of South Carolina Universities. The committee met a total of seven times through the course of the year.

Over the last year, we can report that little more than the development of a framework for future relations has been put in place. A foundation, the South Carolina Universities Research and Education Foundation was formed in November, 1988. The original members of the foundation were the University of South Carolina, Clemson University, and the Medical University of South Carolina. We have been told that South Carolina State College will soon join the foundation. Westinghouse, as the new site contractor, is currently in negotiation with the foundation to identify the nature of future joint ventures. It is reported that the three principal areas of interest are technology transfer, waste management, and the distinguished scientist program. The proposed exclusive non-competitive research relationship, rejected by the general faculty in May, 1988 is no longer part of the negotiations.

The committee remains open to faculty concerns. During the course of the year, we did consider one case of possible abuse of academic freedom but found insufficient evidence for action or recommendation. The committee recognizes the possibility that members of the faculty of the Aiken Campus, because of their proximity to the site, may be particularly subject to pressures resulting from the relationship with the Savannah River Site.

MEMORANDUM

To: Savannah River Review Committee

David Cowen
Paul Huray
Bill Lamprecht
Stanley Rich

Hal French
Peter Sederberg
Timir Datta

From: E. G. Schwartz

Subject: Minutes of November 3 Meeting

Date: November 6, 1989

-

With French and Sederberg not attending, the rest of us discussed the following:

The letter from Prof. Vander Kolk. It was generally agreed that no response was necessary but that we would ask Prof. Sederberg to maintain informal contact.

The Chronicle article on the University of Nevada and Yucca Mountain waste repository. Certain similarities in their situation and ours were noted.

Paul Huray reported the following activities of SCUREF.

A new state tax on the receipt of hazardous wastes is expected to generate from \$600,000 to \$1,000,000 annually which is to support research in SCUREF. Doug Dobson is to chair a policy committee for the use of these funds.

b. There is confidence that a "Center of Creativity" will be funded by DOE at a rate of 2 million dollars per year for 5 years. This is to include the Distinguished Scientist Program which will ultimately support 8 positions at USC, Clemson, and MUSC.

Westinghouse has provided a \$2,000,000 grant for three years in support of parallel computing.

Stanley Rich described an "Instructional Needs Survey" that the USC Aiken Campus is planning to conduct with employees of the Savannah River Site. He also discussed a general uneasiness concerning assignment of faculty to teach courses at the site.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
University Campuses Faculty Senate Meeting

AGENDA

- I. Call To Order
- II. Correction/Approval of Minutes: 15 September 1989
USC-Columbia
Lifelong Learning
Ft. Jackson, SC
- III. Reports from University Officers
 - A. Dr. John J. Duffy, Chancellor
 - B. Professor John N. Gardner, Vice Chancellor
- IV. Reports from Standing Committees
 - A. Rights and Responsibilities - Professor John Logue
 - B. Welfare - Professor Mary Barton
 - C. System Affairs - Professor Paul Stone
- V. Executive Committee - Professor Rick Boulware
- VI. Reports from Special Committees
 - A. University Library Committee - Professor John Catalano
 - B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses - Professor Robert Castleberry
 - C. University Faculty Welfare Committee - Professor Don Curlovic
 - D. Academic Planning Committee - Professor Bruce Nims
 - E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee - Professor Rod Sproatt
 - F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee - Professor Tandy Willis
 - G. Savannah River Site Committee - Professor W. O. Lamprecht, Jr.
 - H. System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee - Professor Robert Costello
 - I. Other Committees
 - 1. Insurance and Annuities Committee - Professor Jerry Dockery
 - 2. Affirmative Action Committee - Professor Deborah Cureton
- VII. Unfinished Business
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Announcements
- X. Adjournment

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

USC Union

Union, SC

November 17, 1989

INFORMAL SESSION

The Senate Chair, Dr. Deborah Cureton, opened this session at 10:00 a.m. She expressed appreciation to USC Union for hosting the University Campuses Faculty Senate. Cureton then turned the floor to Ken Davis, Dean at USC Union. He and Betty Martin, administrative affairs dean, welcomed the members of the Senate and explained the arrangements for the day.

Other campus reports were heard from the following: USC Beaufort by Dean Bashaw; USC Lancaster by Professor Wayne Thurmond for Dean Arnold; Lifelong Learning by Dean May; USC Salkehatchie by Professor Frank Shelton for Dean Clayton. There was no campus report from USC Sumter as Dean Anderson could not attend today's Senate meeting. (For the record, the Sumter faculty organization is entitled to representation on the University Campuses Faculty Senate by nine senators. Professor Sal Macias attended today's meeting as the ninth senator from that campus and became a part of the System Affairs Committee.)

Before moving the Senate into its various committees, Chair Cureton recognized the following guests to today's meeting: Susan Bridwell, dean for telecommunications and independent learning; David Hunter; David Bell; Jim Edwards.

FORMAL SESSION

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair convened the Senate at 2:00 p.m.

II. CORRECTION/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the September 15, 1989, University Campuses Faculty Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

III. REPORTS FROM UNIVERSITY OFFICERS

A. JOHN DUFFY, CHANCELLOR

(The written report from Dr. Duffy appears as an attachment to these minutes. The informal question and answer session that Dr. Duffy held with the Senate has been transcribed and also appears as an attachment to these minutes.)

B. JOHN GARDNER, VICE CHANCELLOR

(The written report submitted by Vice Chancellor Gardner is attached.)

At this point in the informal session of the Senate meeting, the University Campuses Faculty Senate was very fortunate to have been visited by Mr. Jack Whitener, Chairman of the Commission on Higher Education and Dean Emeritus at USC Union.

IV. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE

Professor John Logue

The Rights and Responsibilities Committee convened at 10:30 and dealt with two main issues in the course of its meeting.

The first item of business was to discuss the definition of "faculty" on the University Campuses. Although the committee felt that each campus should have the right to define who should be a voting member of the faculty organization, it was determined that defining faculty rights might be a way of distinguishing the status of University Campuses faculty members from those of the technical colleges. Out of this discussion came the following motion that the committee would like to present to the Faculty Senate as a whole:

MOTION:

In the view of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, the move of the Commission on Higher Education to allow technical colleges to offer associate degrees in academic areas represents a significant erosion of public trust in academic higher education until and unless the Commission is prepared to: a. create faculties on the technical college campuses with the right to self governance; b. institute a system of tenure for faculty at the technical college campuses; c. provide meaningful guarantees that all faculty at technical college campuses, including adjunct faculty, have classroom autonomy.

MOTION CARRIED.

The Committee then considered Gordon Haist's proposal for a statement in the new Faculty Manual concerning faculty evaluation of administrators. After extensive discussion, a revised form of the proposal will be forwarded to the Faculty Manual Revision Committee.

B. WELFARE COMMITTEE

Professor Mary Barton

First of all, the Welfare Committee hopes for the speedy recovery of Dr. Milt Baker.

On behalf of the University Campuses Faculty Senate, the Welfare Committee of the group wants to apprise the Welfare Committee of the USC Columbia Faculty Senate of errors and misconceptions in Recommendation 2 (Minutes of October 23, 1989). USC Columbia receives significant political benefits at no financial cost. This Committee's concerns were referred to John Gardner for an informal approach to dealing with this problem.

Based on the current developments of the "college parallel" programs of the technical colleges combined with the recommendations made at the USC Columbia Faculty Senate Meeting on October 23, 1989, the Welfare Committee has a serious concern regarding the job security problems that may result from falling enrollments. A

clarification of the question of tenure under such conditions was requested by the Committee.

C. SYSTEM AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Professor Paul Stone

A resolution is proposed to recognize Jack Anderson's efforts on the Tech issue:

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS Jack Anderson has tirelessly advocated and actively worked to preserve the integrity of the University of South Carolina System during his administrative tenure, and

WHEREAS he has had unparalleled foresight in his attempting to maintain the distinction between the academic mission of the University Campuses and the technical training mission of the tech schools, and

WHEREAS he has demonstrated exemplary leadership on the tech issue,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University Campuses Faculty Senate gratefully acknowledges his energetic and conscientious efforts on behalf of the University System.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED.

The Committee discussed the possibility of a system-wide catalog of courses. In lieu of other problems between system campuses, discussion was tabled.

The Committee discussed the visiting scholar issue and decided to expand it to include general interest topics as well as academic topics. Further work on this item was tabled until next meeting.

The Adult Learner baccalaureate degree was discussed. The Committee is in favor of this proposal and looks forward to working with Chancellor Duffy's office in developing this proposal.

V. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Rick Boulware

The Executive Committee has met twice since the last meeting of this Senate, and the following motions are a result of this Committee's deliberations:

MOTION FROM COMMITTEE: That the University Campuses Faculty Senate endorse the statement of policy recommended by the System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee as stated by Provost Smith in his letter of June 14, 1989, to Rufus Fellers of the Columbia Faculty Senate --that students whose education is interrupted be given a grace period of five years to continue education under the same catalog.

MOTION PASSED.

MOTION FROM COMMITTEE: That the University Campuses Faculty Senate, in order to complement efforts already being made, form immediately an ad hoc committee to promote the public image of the University Campuses, composed of one representative from each University Campus to be elected by the local faculty organizations, and that Greg Labyak be appointed temporary chair of the committee for the purpose of calling the committee's first meeting.

MOTION PASSED.

VI. REPORTS FROM SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE Professor John Catalano

Dr. Arthur Young, Dean of Libraries, who has been at USC since October, was introduced to the committee by Vice President Terry.

A discussion of the committee's charge as well as its goals and objectives ensued. This included a discussion of how to get more faculty input.

Several concerns and issues were brought to the committee's attention, including reserve room policies, departmental allocation of serials, overdue books. No specific actions were taken by the committee at this time.

Information update: new computer lab in the Thomas Cooper Library; need for and plans to acquire additional CDROM data bases; Dr. Young is to speak at function of College of Information Science December 1.

B. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULA AND COURSES – Professor Robert Castleberry

I have sent two letters to the academic officers of the campuses since we last met. These detailed items under consideration by the committee and are only official upon approval by the Columbia Faculty Senate:

-MIST 103 was deleted but replaced with HIST 107 (Ancient Near Eastern Civilization).

-Psychology had a number of proposals. PSYC 227 now has a prerequisite of MATH 111. Only 6 hours of independent study courses are allowed to apply for a psychology major. Also, psychology majors need to take an animal biology course as part of the basic educational requirements,

-OADM 264 has had a change in description to "modernize" the course.

-Physics has suggested changes to the physics curriculum, including the creation of new courses (PHYS 205 & 303) and the deletion of others (PHYS 213 & 213L).

The committee is also working on (1) trying to standardize the wording of all the descriptions of independent study courses, and (2) the identification of courses in the curriculum which are not regularly taught (so that superfluous courses might be deleted).

C UNIVERSITY FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE Professor Don Curlovic

The committee met on October 23, 1989, and approved a report on "Salaries, Budgets, and 2001" which was included with the Faculty Senate Agenda for Wednesday, November 1, 1989. It is recommended that all faculty read this report since its suggestions have implications which affect the University Campuses.

D. ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Professor Bruce Nims

The Academic Planning Committee met on October 18 and November 15, 1989, at the Faculty House, USC Columbia. On October 18, the committee discussed its mission and Chair Alexander Gilchrist of USC Columbia agreed to meet with Provost Smith to get his opinions on what the committee's charge should be.

On November 15, the committee met with Provost Smith. He asked the committee to advise the President concerning a request by Coastal Carolina College for the submission of a letter of intent with the Commission on Higher Education to study the feasibility of offering masters degrees in education at Coastal. In addition, the committee decided to solicit factual data from the Faculty Welfare Committee of USC Columbia concerning several of its recommendations contained in a recent report to the Columbia Faculty Senate.

E. FACULTY/BOARD OF TRUSTEES LIAISON COMMITTEE –
Professor Rod Sproatt

The committee met on November 9, 1989, to consider matters in executive and open sessions. Executive session: personnel matters; honorary degrees.

Open session: changed the composition of the committee to include the Chair-Elect of the Columbia Campus Senate; passed an extension of the Nurse Anesthetist program in the College of Nursing; passed and expanded the telecommunications component of the Master's Degree in Health Nursing, College of Nursing, USC Columbia, for family care practice; passed formation of the USC Cancer Research Center; discussion of the CHE vote to allow Tech schools to offer associate degrees.

F. RESEARCH AND PRODUCTIVE SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE
Professor Tandy Willis

This is a very large committee which is divided into three smaller subcommittees: Engineering and Physical Sciences; Social and Behavioral Sciences; Arts and Humanities.

All three subcommittees met last week, and I have received the following information from SPAR (Sponsored Programs and Research) regarding the outcomes of those meetings:

- 1) Engineering and Physical Sciences had 20 proposals submitted to that committee; 9 proposals were funded for a total of \$15,000; no applications were received from the University Campuses
- 2) . Social and Behavioral Sciences had 11 proposals submitted, 3 of which were funded for a total of \$8,551; no applications were received from the University Campuses; one proposal was received from USC Aiken.
- 3) Arts and Humanities received 12 proposals, 9 of which were funded for a total of \$12,888; of the funded proposals, 1 from USC Aiken, 3 from USC Spartanburg, 1 from USC Salkehatchie.

The range of funding amounts from this committee is \$300 to \$3,000. Applications/proposals from the University Campuses are encouraged. There will be a second funding cycle which will occur in the spring semester. Applications from all University Campuses will be welcomed at that time.

G. SAVANNAH RIVER REVIEW COMMITTEE –
Professor W. O. Lamprecht, Jr.

(The report from Professor Lamprecht consists of two memoranda submitted by him to this Senate. These memoranda, dated April 24, 1989, and November 6, 1989, are attached to these Minutes.)

H. SYSTEM ACADEMIC POLICY COORDINATING & COMMITTEE – Professor Robert Costello

The committee met on November 16, 1989, in Columbia. The published agenda included three items: 1) reports on progress toward implementation of the new policy pertaining to which BULLETIN applies to graduation requirements for a student entering the system. 2) consideration of whether to modify the allowance of five years continuous absence by a student without losing the right to graduate under the BULLETIN requirements in effect at the time of original matriculation in the USC System. 3) desirability of maintaining a single grading system for all undergraduate programs.

At the request of Opal Brown of USC Columbia, action on all the aforementioned agenda items was deferred to consider proposals originating at USC Columbia to re-examine both the purpose and process of the committee. Her proposals included limitation of the scope of committee action to academic policy matters that are a part of the central student records and the requirement that all committee recommendations be approved by all five Senates before being passed on to the President.

Provost Smith pointed out that a major purpose of the committee as constituted by the President was to deal with important system issues upon which unanimity might not exist. He pointed out that the committee is a presidential advisory committee, not a creation of the Senates.

A lengthy discussion of autonomy concerns of Columbia and the four-year campuses ensued, with emphasis on how to balance these concerns with the desirability of better integrated system function. During the discussion, the Provost exhibited a clear understanding of the threat posed to the USC System by alternative agendas for higher education in our state. The meeting adjourned without action.

I. OTHER COMMITTEES

INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES COMMITTEE – Professor Jerry Dockery

This committee reviewed Midland Risk Company's proposal to offer personal automobile insurance on a payroll-deducted basis to USC employees who are law enforcement officers and graduates of the S.C. Criminal Justice Academy.

Because of the low numbers of USC employees **affected** (less than 100), the committee rejected the request based on Section 8-11-80 of the S.C. Code of Laws.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was none.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The University Campuses Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rick D. Boulware
Scribe

Attachments: UCFS Standing Committee members,
T&P Committee and Grievance Committee members,
report and address of Chancellor Duffy
report and address of Vice Chancellor Gardner
memoranda from Savannah River Review Committee

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS FOR 1898/1990

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE

Beaufort: Ellen Chamberlain, Gordon Haist, Jane Upshaw
Lancaster: Bruce Nims, Danny Faulkner
Lifelong Learning: Jerry Dockery, John Stine
Salkehatchie: Milton Harden
Sumter: John Logue (Chair), Nancy McDonald, Charles Cook
Union: Tandy Willis

SYSTEM AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Beaufort: Rod Sproatt
Lancaster: John Catalano, Wayne Thurman
Lifelong Learning: Steve Dalton
Salkehatchie: Paul Stone (Chair), Sandra Willis
Sumter: Robert Castleberry, Richard Bell, Sal Macias,
Robert Costello (ex officio) Union: Susan Smith

WELFARE COMMITTEE

Beaufort: John Blair
Lancaster: Wade Chittam, Noni Bohonak
Lifelong Learning: Dave Bowden, Linda Holderfield
Salkehatchie: Susan Moskow
Sumter: Kay Oldhouser, Haas **Raval**, John Safford
Union: Mary Barton (Chair)

University Campuses Faculty Senate

University Campuses
Tenure and Promotion Committee
Committee

University Campuses
Grievance Committee

USC-Beaufort	Edsel Caine Joan S. Taylor	Rod H. Sproatt
USC-Lancaster	Wade Chittam Wayne Thurman	Wayne Thurman
Lifelong Learning	Dave Bowder Steve Dalton	Linda Holderfield
USC-Salkehatchie	Larry Strong Arthur Mitchell	Arthur Mitchell
USC-Sumter	John Barrett John Logue	Jean Hatcher
USC-Union	Betty Martin Tandy Willis	

REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SEN'ATE
NOVEMBER 17, 1989
UNION, SC

CHE Action on TEC Proposals

On Thursday, November 2, the CHE accepted the staff recommendation **that the TEC proposal for college parallel programs at the nine TEC campuses which did not previously have the program be approved.** Thus, college parallel programs have been approved at Sumter TEC, The Technical College of the Low Country, Denmark TEC, Florence/Darlington TEC, Orangeburg/Calhoun TEC, Spartanburg TEC, Horry/Georgetown TEC, Aiken TEC, and Piedmont TEC.

In its arguments against the proposal, USC charged duplication of effort, lack of evidence that the programs were needed, inadequate consideration on the part of the Commission of the cost of the program to the state, and questioned the need for a community college program in general, given the criticisms of the community college concept which continue to surface nationally.

Dr. Morris of the State TEC Board and Mr. Sheheen based their arguments on access and cost to the student. They argued that the program would open higher education up to minority groups at an affordable price. Commissioner Sheheen eloquently pleaded that students who enrolled in a college parallel program and found they could not do the work, could shift to another program of study without suffering the stigma of failure. Dr. Morris contended that the pool of students whom TEC sought to enroll would be differing from those currently enrolled at USC branches.

USC officials pointed out that the existing college parallel programs in the seven TEC institutions enroll only 14% minority as opposed to 16% for USC campuses. Furthermore according to the Commission's analysis minority enrollment has actually declined over the past year. By contrast, USC-Salkehatchie enrolled 27% minority students in 1988--up from 21% in 1987. The current completion rates for the AA and AS degrees in college parallel programs at the seven TEC campuses is extremely low. A copy of the pertinent statistics is attached to this report. You may make your own judgments and draw your own conclusions as to the validity of the various arguments.

The action noted above, preliminary reaction to our proposals concerning learning centers, and a staff request that we review our University Campuses' missions statements do not bode well for our Campuses. This is not the time for recriminations, panic, striking out on your own, and general malaise, but rather for systematic planning of how best to present our concepts to the University administration, Board, CHE, and the legislature.

Distance Education

After its regular meeting, several members of the CHE and its staff, including Mr. Sheheen, attended a presentation hosted by the Provost on Distance Education and the On-Line Library Catalogue System including the delivery system of the Library Processing Center. Distance Education deals not only with television-assisted instruction but also with Graduate Regional Studies. The programs have existed in the University for 20 years, starting with APOGEE, Engineering, and the MBA program, Business. In addition, the Colleges of Education, Library and

Information Science, Social Work, Health, Nursing, and Humanities are all active in this area. Currently, most of the work is at the graduate level but our office of Telecommunications is investigating the possibility of delivering some undergraduate work.

Visit to Louisiana

On November 3, Senator Phil Leventis, Dean Anderson, Dean Lisk, and I visited with officials of LSU-Baton Rouge and LSU-Alexandria to study a limited four-year degree program at Alexandria offered through the auspices of Continuing Education at Baton Rouge.

Budgets and Legislative Matters

Representative Hirsch's committee found its visits to all college campuses in the state to be quite useful and informative. The committee is convinced that every effort should be made to fund the formula. At this point, however, state officials are uncertain about what the economic outlook is for next year because of Hugo and a predicted possible downturn in the national economy.

Dr. Baker's Illness

Dr. Baker has been out ill for more than 2 months. Because of this, the normal salary reports which he routinely does for the Senate have been delayed.

Campus Visits

Our Office hopes to increase the frequency of our campus visits this semester. If funds are available, we plan to renew the bus trips in which we invite Columbia staff and faculty to visit the Campuses to get a first-hand view of what we are about.

Students in General Arts and Sciences
Enrolled in Fall 1987 Degrees Awarded 86-87

<u>Total Black</u>	<u>Total Black</u>			
Midlands Tech	1,144	295	31	11
York Tech	299	48	1	0
Trident Tech	390	59	1	0
Tri-County Tech	568	50	22	1
Williamsburg Tech	55	15	5	1
Chesterfield/Marlboro	142	28	11	0
Greenville Tech	<u>1,275</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>3</u>
	3,873	571	146	16

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research. 11/2/89

~Enrolled in Fall 1988 Total Degrees A~--arded

	Total	Black	1987-88
Midlands Tech	1,672	391	23
Trident Tech	557	66	0
Tri-County Tech	540	30	17
Willameburg Tech	77	17	6
Chesterfield/Marlboro	121	30	i2
Greenville Tech	1,333	79	0
York Tech	<u>425</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>
	4,725	618	63

USC ENROLLMENT

	<u>1987</u>		<u>1988</u>	
	Total	Black	Total	Black
Beaufort	888	123 (13.85)	1,010	137 (13.56)
Lancaster	1,018	149 (14.63)	1,004	137 (13.64)
Salkehatchie	541	115 (21.25)	628	167 (26.59)
Sumter	1,292	206 (15.94)	1,440	227 (15./6)
Union	319	48 (15.04)	343	58 (16.90)
Totals	4,048	641 (15.83)	4,425	726 (16.41)

—1 ~—

Degrees Awarded in General Arts & Sciences

FY 86-87	FY 86-87		FY 87-88	
	Total	Black	Total	Black
Beaufort	39	6	55	9
Laneaster	g3	10	66	;0
Salkehatchie	51	20	34	::
Sumter	75	14	123	:7
Union	29	5	30	6

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research.

cc

11 -2-89

INFORMAL QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING USC-UNION, November 17, 1989
CHANCELLOR DUFFY

Dr. Duffy: We have my report and John's report. John is at the meeting Jim Rex had with the Columbia officials--that's why he's not here. He might be here later. He reports here on the Dean's search at Beaufort, all campus proposals, CHE, etc. Everybody get a chance to read this? Any questions on this that you want to raise at this point?

Professor Upshaw: Dr. Duffy, I'd like to ask what you foresee as the outcome of the meeting today. Is this a substantive meeting that they're going to and can it, in effect, do anything about the CHE vote two weeks ago?

Duffy: You mean, is it a substantive meeting? Yes. The purpose of the meeting, it's an on-going thing. It's a group that Jim Rex put together, I think, when he was Dean of Education at Winthrop. It's basically a public policy group that brings educators and legislators and other interested people together to talk about issues that are of concern to, you know well, the legislators, and as John points out in his thing today, they were going to have Sheheen, Mack Holderfield, Bob Alexander, Dr. Stokes, Bob Stokes, Southern Regional Educational Board, and others. You know, it's just a forum; it's not a legislative body by any shot. You want me to fill you in on what's going on?

All right. Essentially, the Tech proposal passed the Commission. It was recommended to the Commission by the staff and they bought it. The staff report is interesting; I wish I'd had it about a month before I got hold of it, and my report deals with it a little bit. The staff report could be used to boast almost any position. The most striking thing to me was that this was a program, a program which was sold on the grounds that it would increase minority enrollments, that it would, you know, offer access to those who might not otherwise have access, and it was just beautiful, and I frankly had tears in my eyes as I listened to Morrison and Sheheen. I asked questions that frankly they have not bothered to answer. I have the answers in the notes I gave you, and that is, that this program has been in effect for seven years. I think it is a legitimate question to ask, then, in its seven years of operation, has it increased significantly the number of minorities going to college? And the answer, I think -- I said you could draw your own conclusions -- obviously I have drawn my conclusions. Since 1987, at Tech, 299 students enrolled in this program, 48 of them were black, and there was one graduate. This really shows me the tremendous demand for this program in the state at large. Williamsburg Tech, in 1987 -- Williamsburg I might add is primarily minority here -- it must be 70% black population -

Williamsburg Tech had 55 students enrolled in this program, 15 of them from minority, 5 graduates, and one minority graduate.

Now I understand why there are no takers for the degree. I understand that quite well. We have the same problem in our own associate degrees. Those degrees don't mean anything to students who are enrolled in a baccalaureate program, who think of themselves as in a baccalaureate program. The degree does mean something, and I historically support it, to certain students -- to military, for example, because it sort of punches one of their cards to have an associate degree. And some adults, who feel the need to have some kind of marker that they can point to. In continuing ed for years, we've recognized that need for the 30-hour certificates, and whatever. So I'm not surprised at that. What does surprise me is the very low incidence of minorities in their enrollments and this is borne out in the CHE study. Tech actually has 14% minority enrollments in these programs. If you look closer at the statistics, you'd find out that if it weren't for Midlands Tech and Trident Tech, that 14% would be

significantly lower -- Midlands Tech and Trident Tech apparently. Greenville Tech: 76 blacks out of 1275 students enrolled. Now, that contrasts with our campuses, I think, yeah, Beaufort in 1987, you know, I'm a little bit more at ease with the 1987 figures, I must add -- although you swear by the 1988 figures, or on your soul...eh? All right. Let me tell you that when these figures came to me, they were so bad in terms of what Tech was talking about that I could not believe them, and I had them checked, double checked, and triple checked. I would have at least got a gun out and made some people sign up for these associate degrees myself. Lancaster had 14.63%, Salkehatchie 21.25%, Sumter 15.9 -- of course, our minority enrollments are much better than the average, except on one campus, and that's Beaufort, and there it's right on the average if you round out. The 1988 figures telling in fact. This study, that the upon, points out that their enrollments . You know, it's a ridiculous kind of thing made, nothing, no needs assessments were Mr. Sheheen got up and rather eloquently spoke to the human side of the equation: how a student admitted, say to one of our campuses, and obviously to the University of South Carolina, or to a four-year college, who doesn't quite cut it for one reason or another, and then because they have to drop out and go to another institution; whereas, if they're in the same institution, the student can drop out of that program and move into another program and not feel the stigma of failure. And frankly, I felt like, God, I've been transported back into about 1965-75, where we're dealing with high school...where the students should not feel the stigma of failure. If a student fails, per chance, at the academic side, then we put them into something else -- basket-weaving or something else -- and at the end of four years, the unstigmatized student emerges with a high school diploma and absolutely nothing else...which you know I was almost tearful when I heard that.

We're all...we got beat on this issue. We got beat because they sold it as an access issue and a lot of people were sold on the access issue. The evidence that it was not an access issue didn't come up with them until later. We got beat purely because we got out-maneuvered. Tech spent a good portion of more than a year selling this thing, over and over again, repeating. We got ourselves maneuvered in this situation. We would seem to be selfishly defending turf, opposing motherhood, and opposing ideas that are quite, you know, quintessential in a democratic society. We have, in my opinion, a series of proposals before Tech -- well not before Tech -- before the Commission, and we now have the fob of going out and selling those things over the next year, in the same way that Tech did. In the end, I mean, we have, we can't just sit back and say we're going to wait on Columbia to sell our...we're going to wait on John Duffy to sell that, or anybody else. You've got to sell it. Regardless, you've got to get in there and sell those things, basically.

The cost situation: the cost to Tech. You know, one of the arguments is that Tech students only pay \$600 -- that kind of stuff. Sure, they only pay \$600. If we were funded in the same way, our students would only pay \$600. Automatically, the way the formula works, deduct ZO% on the assumption that that's what we're going to collect in tuition; whereas in the case of Tech, they deduct only what is actually collected. And Tech will also turn around and say, now, we don't get funding for, you know, buildings--for maintenance. That is not true. They do. For instance, in Beaufort, and they get it at Denmark Tec. They don't get it at the other campuses because there's a specified amount of money that the county councils put up for that purpose. In the case of Beaufort, they get the same. You say, why don't we point to the argument that Lowcountry Technical College gets about twice as much in FTE as Beaufort. Immediately, Fred will turn to you and say, as he did, in fact, it's pretty ridiculous to argue, to try to argue, these cost figures in front of a group--say, any group--because all they have to do is assert. I can get up and scream, yell loud enough that the cost is the same; they will argue that the cost is cheaper...and the costs are the same basically. A freshman student costs about as much, because of the formula, the way the formula operates, a freshman student taking English, math, foreign language, history, and science, is going to cost as much here as it does at Tech, or, for that matter, with some slight differential, because of the physical plant and all,

the same as at Columbia. The academic--what's cranked up by the formula for the instructional thing--would be the same. So, that's what we got beat on. There is some possibility that the legislature might act on it or that there might be some act in the legislature. There seems to be a growing feeling that, certainly in the case of Beaufort and Sumter, the thing doesn't make too much sense. I've been asked, the Board wants us to prepare something for them on the issue, the State newspaper wants something on this issue. It's hardly dead issue at this point. But, on the other hand, you realize that the Commission's action should be final under the law. Of course, the legislature could get into the act anytime it wanted to, and, that's basically where we are. In terms of those proposals that we have to the Commission, they won't be acted on until next April. There was an attempt to act on the Aiken/Beaufort, Beaufort/Aiken/Sumter things yesterday, but it was beaten down, and frankly, we need the time to develop our position papers, and all that. But, frankly, I don't think that those things are going to get through by some immaculate conception: we have to get out and work for them. And we have to be rational about it. Can't get up and scream and call them names and all that. We basically have to make a case for what we are doing, and this business of just sitting back and automatically reacting negatively against the Commission is not going to work. The Commission has certain powers, granted by the legislature, and we may as well face up to that. And I know I'm right with that because I've said that to Columbia, and I say it now.

Professor Sproatt: You said that the vote on the proposals for Aiken and Beaufort were beaten back?

Duffy: They decided they didn't have enough information...the Commission had come...the Commission staff had come up with a proposal in the case of Aiken to Sumter. They wanted those things phased out by '91, and then they wanted Columbia to offer those courses in Sumter with a step12 kick to Columbia to do it. Why? I have no idea. I have suspicions, but I don't want to deal with that. But, you know what I mean, it doesn't make much sense. In the case of Beaufort, they came up with one that I thought was absolutely marvelous and that is that that one be done, that we do away with by '90, and we meet your needs for distance education, with telecommunications, GRS television mode. You know we've been thinking along those lines, that that is a possible solution to this problem. But to be honest with you, we figured it would take three years to get that one off the ground. Where's Susan [Bridwell]? Is Susan there? Isn't that what we figured? At least three years? (Bridwell: Maybe two.) OK, maybe two. But still that's one we would need time.

Sproatt: That would include education, because by state law, and things I'm sure you're familiar with, in order to be able to award a teaching certificate, you have to have graduated from an approved program; so that would mean that you would become an approved program for teacher education?

Duffy: You're right. We can't do it in teacher education from Columbia.

Sproatt: Right.

Duffy: We could conceivably do it from Aiken, conceivably do it from Coastal, and we will go along with the Coastal thing anyway. Apparently the Sumter students have to go to Coastal for a block of courses taken in the fall of what is their senior year, and we've already looked in--I've looked in--we are very seriously examining the possibility of offering that block in a telecommunications mode--which is not straight television. It involves, you know, visits, television systems instruction.

Sproatt: Since the students that we have in Beaufort find it very difficult to travel--the access argument that Tech made is right on the mark for our students, in that, as I've told a couple of people here, we have more student teachers in the Aiken program in Beaufort than they do in Aiken.

Duffy: Well, let's not point it out. The access, yeah, right on target. The access argument that Tech used is the access argument that we can use, only our figures, I think, are better in terms of what's happened with where we've created these things. And we have to prove that to somebody besides ourselves. We sit around and say how great we are and what we're doing. We've got to prove that to some external judges, in this instance, the Commission on Higher Education, the members of the Commission. And we haven't done that. And we're gonna do it, and if we don't do it, we're going to be out of business.

Unidentified Senator: I was wondering about the legislative support for us on the issues that recently passed the Commission, and we understand that there were three letters in our favor and forty-seven on the other side?

Duffy: Yeah. Representative Herb Kirsch, who is the chair of the subcommittee on the budget. On the budget. You know the budget committee. The House Committee -- Appropriation Committee -- has a subcommittee, and it deals with higher education budgets. Therefore, it deals with our budgets and deals with the Tech commissions budgets, and the chairman of that committee and his two members, two subcommittee members, there are three of them, were concerned, were expressing a concern, about this particular move, etc., so he wrote asking that they defer, to stop it. Not stopping it--but that they give it some thought of what the cost might be. And then Waddell's Finance Committee wrote out saying--didn't necessarily oppose it--but they wanted to know all about it. And Peden McLeod had written one some time before, and then it was pretty obviously what happened. All the letters were dated the same day, and some of them were quite good. The one that David Beasley did was quite good, had obviously been thought out. But some of the things I had a hard time figuring out whether they were for or against. One, for instance, said the program worked so good in the Midlands, he hated to see anything done to it. Well, nobody's threatened what's happening in the Midlands. It may backfire; it was a cute move. What they were able to do was to take Kirsch's letter and Waddell's letter and bury them into the middle of these things--which is fine in games, and one might say that you've scored a point--but I suspect that it might make some people mad.

Unidentified Senator: Are those letters available?

Duffy: Yeah. They're in my office. I thought we mailed them. We didn't mail them? Well, they're there; you can have them. We also have computer printout.

Questioner: Copies?

Duffy: Yeah, sure. I thought we had done that.

Questioner: You could have. I have so much paper work flowing just now, that it could have been...

Duffy: I sent copies of letters that came from people in their areas whom we had always thought of as being tremendous supporters.

Upshaw: Dr. Duffy, in the Commission meeting, they were quoting approximately \$10 million that this program would cost over the next three years. I think it's 2.7, 2.9, and 3.2. My question is: Is that money already appropriated through the cutting edge, or is it already appropriated as some package, or does the legislature have to appropriate that to implement this program?

Duffy: Well, what Tech said, in effect, was that that money is already there. For the shot, the opening gun, that they've already got the money, that they don't need any additional money. That they can find their own internal reallocation -- and they can do this -- it's only \$3 million on a budget of \$200 million is not that much money to move around. Then in terms of what it will cost in the future, Commissioner Sheheen has pointed out that the cost is simply related to the formula and that the formula would generate these dollars whether they go to Beaufort or to Lowcountry Tech. So, in that sense, it wouldn't cost the State that much. But you know, like the library question, which is, we've got this library set up that, over the years, is quite good. Will not only support the undergraduates but will support some which have graduate degrees. The Commissioner can't see why that can't be used to support Tech, the same way it's being used to support our campuses. In fact, he's as much as said that with the question of Aiken. We all have these arrangements. Everybody has, except Aiken, for some reason. So Aiken was not able to argue that they had this sign-off agreement. So, Aiken ended up by not having, by any stretch of the imagination, enough books, or access to books, to pay for it, and that was brought out. It was pointed out that the Chancellor at Aiken said he wasn't going to let them use the library anyway, and Fred [Sheheen] said, well, he'd see about that. You know, it's going to be pretty tough to be in a position to be justified in saying...how about looking in your newspaper and they've got your Dean or Chancellor saying, "I'm sorry, but we can't let those people down the street use our books." Our books have been paid for by the State is the way people look at it.

Professor Chamberlain: Dr. Duffy, however, on Hilton Head, where we're going into the same facility with Tech and Tech is going to use our library services, our staff, and our interlibrary loan, and if Fred Sheheen says that. Now, I've completed a memo for Dean Bashaw trying to list all the expenses that I could think of that we would incur by offering library services on Hilton Head, and it came to a sizable amount. And it seems to me that if we're sharing the same facilities with Tech people, it seems to me that we should be splitting the cost of the library service down the middle...because they would come right into the library, use the services, and they wouldn't pay for them unless we had some kind of agreement up front. We couldn't keep them from using them. So it would behoove us to sign an agreement with them in advance, saying it's going to cost you so much annually in order to use the library. Now I understand that Fred Sheheen says no way...the Tech people are allowed to use the University library facilities for nothing. And if that's the case, the people who pay to send their family members to the University of South Carolina are literally supporting the Tech people, as well, by supplying this service.

Duffy: I have reservations. I don't have knowledge of Fred saying anything to that extent, and I'm certainly going to ask him...certainly not officially.

Chamberlain: Are you saying, then, that it's OK for us to cut a deal with the Tech people and get them to pay up front?

Duffy: Well, you know, something like that would have to be negotiated, but I've not heard anything like this. Not heard that. I'd like to know what the source of it is. Who said that? Fred said that?

Chamberlain: I heard it came through you.

Duffy: From me? I'm aware of the fact that he thinks that we can support what we're doing with this infrastructure. I hadn't said that he had said anything specifically.

Professor Caine: It came from the coordinator of the military programs.

Duffy: Then he heard it straight from the lips of Fred? OK. One point is, I think, that we would be well advised to do what most of us have been trained to do: to check our sources, to validate our information. And you know, I think I might know what you're talking about; I think I might know where he might be coming from on that. I don't blame him; if I were in his position, I would be too. In fact, in my position, I am, too. But I think we have to deal with what we're actually dealing with, not with what we anticipate. There's a lot of anticipation going on and a lot of philosophizing that's going to get in the damn way of working this thing through, to be honest with you. I can't be any more candid than that. There's a lot of counterproductive crap going on.

Sproatt: In that same category...

Duffy: Crap category?

Sproatt: I mean, if we can talk practically here, I think if you would talk to various people in this room, we all have heard various horror stories, scenarios, and so forth, and a big concern since this has been going on for at least a year that the University's been aware of, there seemingly hasn't been a great effort to stop this, at least not until the eleventh inning, and there's this creeping paranoia that there's this grand plan that the University has to set up and trade us for a super computer or the top 100, or whatever, and I -- could you address that?

Duffy: Yeah. Very clearly. I'll address it. I wish we did have a plan. In fact, what I'm suggesting that we need a plan. I'm suggesting that we need a plan. One way or the other -- there's David Bell. Haven't I said this, David, rather openly and publicly?

David Bell: Certainly have.

Duffy: ...and this instance, it's not a plan, but a lack of a plan. There are a lot of people that feel that we ought not be combative...that we should have people from outside, external people. For instance, if you went up to the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, they know that there are three institutions in the State that they know about: Clemson, USC and Tech. 'Cause that's all they got. And they can't see why the University of South Carolina, Columbia, should be concerned about the University of South Carolina, Spartanburg, University of South Carolina, Beaufort. And you know, there is that kind of thinking, and it's understandable. And certainly there are people in Columbia that want to downscale the University...that would buy off on the concept of the three-tiered system of higher education...people perfectly happy with it and wish all of you'd go away. I mean there's people like that.

Sproatt: "Are those people top administration?" is what we're asking.

Duffy: No. I don't think so. I really don't. Top administration, I think, is still committed to the System. Only, top administration is asking some questions that I think should be asked, and trying to deal with some of the tensions that exist. We were talking about this earlier today.

Some of the people that talk system have been doing so for years, but they don't mean system. Once their office begins to get goosed, they begin to get all excited and they argue. I've got one campus, and you wouldn't believe the nonsense that comes out of that place. And it's not Columbia, in terms of what they want by way of quality and all that. And quality doesn't exist except there. In fact, that particular campus questioned faculty members who had been approved by Columbia departments. But I'm not aware of any trade-off. I am aware of the fact that the Commission talks about that sort of thing. When you're dealing with somebody like Fred Sheheen, you're not dealing with somebody who was born yesterday. You're dealing with a guy with a record that's twenty-odd years old. That hasn't changed. I'm reminded John Martin once said of Woodrow Wilson: Woodrow Wilson was a brilliant man. Trouble is he hasn't had a damn idea since he graduated from college, and that was thirty years ago. And there are people like that. Single-minded devotion in spite of everything. That is evidenced by the Commission. He [Sheheen] knows what he wants to do; you know what he wants to do; I know what he wants to do.

Sproatt: Well, along those same lines, then if they are trying to fix it where we can't, or have a difficult time, distinguishing ourselves, are they going to bite these distant learning concepts, the concept of a learning center on this campus so that we can provide access...

Duffy: No plans to my knowledge. The distant learner concept and all that kind of thing -- relatively new for the Commission. It's been around for years, but it's relatively new.

Sproatt: Seems like they're holding us here, so we can't distinguish ourselves...

Duffy: That's a possibility. I see that as a possibility. No, I really do, and I understand the problem on that.

Questioner: I had a question on the distant education and the Coastal/Sumter educational services -- said you'd investigated that seriously? Were you also looking into seriously retaining the program as it now exists?

Duffy: I'm sorry. What do you mean?

Questioner: Well, you talked about substituting one for another; what about just continuing the program as it now exists? What is needed to allow that?

Duffy: The distance learner stuff won't work unless we can continue to teach some of those courses that we have been teaching. We can't do all that by television. But I understand your question. We aren't. We try to cover that base too. You know, there's a scenario -- I don't want to get everybody paranoid -- for instance, they could simply say, well, we're not going to give credit, we're not going to give FTE for the 300 work at the campuses because they give only 100 and 200. And they could also get you on the other hand and say well, we're also not going to give if University Campuses insist on separating themselves from Tech...money for the so-called remedial...that's a possibility. You know, the only reason I hesitate to talk about it is that I'm not sure all this has occurred to them yet, but they're all possibilities, possible scenarios. But the only thing I'm suggesting is that rather than sitting around and stewing over these possible scenarios is to start basically to cover ourselves. One is, we need to show someone other than ourselves, our wives, our spouses, our children, and our pet dog, who believes everything we say, that what we're doing is important. It's essential, and we do a better job of it than anybody else. We've got to do that. Defending this program that we've got to the Commissioners and the legislators is the way to do it -- not just sitting around steaming

about Fred. And we talk about the Commission as if it existed out in space somewhere. We never have worked with the Commission the way we work with the Legislature, and we need to do that. And they're pretty rational people; they listen to arguments; they have no, as far as I know, they have no particular reason to be opposed to the concept we're trying to sell.

Questioner: You've practically answered my question. A lot of discussion now on where and how to focus our efforts. Many people have begun these kinds of things but, obviously on the one hand, we need to think about the Commission and our upcoming off-campus and cooperative four-year programs. But as you said, the parallel college program issue is not a dead one. Just wondered about your thoughts on how we might proceed on an issue that has already been settled, but has not been settled. Obviously that's the focus on the Legislature at this point. It's in the Legislature's arena now, right?

Duffy: Not necessarily.

Questioner: No?

Duffy: I mean, it's probably ...that's the way it looks like....there may be some activity. No, I think, when you have a legislative delegation that's so totally opposed to the thing, that they probably could exert some pressure on the local tec center. Beaufort: seems to me there is a pressure point there. I think, for instance, it was reported, it was in the PACKET, that all of a sudden, people pushing a consortium on Hilton Head, realized that what they might have ended up with this Lowcountry Tech thing was what they did not want, and that's only the first two years. They didn't want that. I mean the local people, the people that vote. One of the things we ran into in talking with certain Commission members was the question of access--they honest to God bought off on the idea of access. That this is access. When the statistics indicate that this is not access. I mean this is a trick; this is something they've been doing to minorities for 25 years, and it's ...give them access to what? You know, let them into community colleges, teach them computers, or teach them any number of things. Only they can't get jobs. When they get to the outside, they haven't been taught anything. So they go back, grab another ring and take another course. I know you're going to be shocked that when Ronald Reagan was governor of California had a report done that basically indicted the community college system in California...said it was not an educational system; it was a welfare system. I think all that needs to be pointed out, and you have to be very careful because, let's face it, the people of South Carolina are very proud of certain things. And they are proud because they've been told that these things are great. And one of the things is their state tech system. Their tech system in terms of meeting the needs for jobs over the '60's and '70's did a fantastic job - no question about that. So don't attack tech schools; talk about community colleges. That's my strategy.

Questioner: Is the University prepared to commit staff and money to the success of a public relations effort to get across the message to the State that the University Campuses are going to do the job, or are you just suggesting that we should lobby the legislators?

Duffy: You mean go into a full-scale PR campaign?

Questioner: I mean a full-scale campaign like Tech has been doing for some time.

Duffy: I don't think so. I mean, I don't know; nobody's asked me. How do I feel personally about those things? I think if you've got to hire a PR agent to make the point, we probably shouldn't be in the business. I know what you're saying. I hired someone a couple of years ago

from Tech, hired at another campus, and was put on a committee to work with me, and we talked. At the first meeting, this person's first suggestion, right out of the box, was to hire a PR firm! Frankly, maybe it's the way to do it. But I happen to come out of a more conservative school of thought that doesn't believe the University needs to hire a PR firm.

Caine: Do you think there are other options that will work?

Duffy: No, not necessarily.

Caine: We've lost students.

Duffy: You lost on this one issue.

Caine: We lost the class suit before the Tech board, or least before the CHE.

Duffy: Yeah, but it wasn't a PR firm that sold those commissioners .

Caine: It could have made a difference if there had been a public sentiment that we were doing a good job and that we were providing access. The lack of public sentiment is what got us into trouble and what caused that was the lack of public relations.

Duffy: I don't think it's public sentiment or public relations in that sense.

Caine: Public perception.

Duffy: Yeah, well, your opinion on this is as good as mine, which is, and neither one of us is worth a damn...(laughter)...but I'm not sure the kind of effort I was thinking should be done by individuals working rather than a slick PR firm. But maybe you're right. Maybe we need that. That's something to think about.

Upshaw: Dr. Duffy, I think we feel, all of us, some sense of competition in this matter. My husband called me yesterday morning before 8:00 and said, "I just want you to know that Technical College of the Lowcountry not only has a billboard and not only is putting half-page ads in the ISLAND PACKET and not only putting radio ads all over the radio, but now they're putting television ads on the television." And I think that people who are already educated, there's no question about where they want their child to go to school. I had a teacher tell me, whose child didn't make it at Ohio State and she came to USCB this year, "I can't tell you how pleased we are with what she's doing and what she's learning and the whole educational atmosphere there." But this is an educated person already, and I think our concern is, in this competitive situation, we want to get people who don't know our story, as well as other people.

Unidentified Speaker: There's where the PR can help, because in 15 seconds of saying exactly that on 12 television stations across the state at the 11:00 local news could turn the whole institution around.

Upshaw: And nobody, in my opinion, is saying that that alone will answer the problem. I think all of us recognize that and that we have to put our very best foot forward in this situation. We should have been doing it already. Then, maybe if we had been doing it already, this would not have happened to us in the first place. But we haven't, and we have to do that. But I think we

would also like to have a united, concerted effort on all fronts that answers this competitive situation that we are in.

Duffy: Well, I mean I'm not absolutely opposed to -- it's just that -- I don't know. I will raise the issue. I still think that one article that is generated on the news side of the House, as opposed to an advertisement, might take the...the article on the news side. I have seen the full-page ads, which are rather garish, particularly in the evening edition. Now they may have a PR firm. Some of it may be overkill, but, I mean, it's an interesting point. It'll be interesting to see what happens, particularly down there [Beaufort].

Unidentified Questioner: Would the University Campuses eventually no longer be associated with the University?

Duffy: That's a possibility. You ask the question, I mean, what I'm asking you is how are you going to distinguish what you're doing? How are you going to differentiate what you're doing? Let's say, we need to get a PR firm. Where and how's the PR firm going to tell us how we're different?

Sproatt: That depends on the resources.

Duffy: The only resources you can possibly expect are the resources generated by the formula, because Columbia has no more than you do.

Chamberlain: Well we've thought about this, and we've talked about it in different ways, and one of the ways we would distinguish ourselves is to move into the area of offering more upper-level courses and providing access to baccalaureate degrees that the Tech system says they're doing by starting students out. And I asked this question earlier today, and I know there's an answer, but I'd like to ask it again, and that is, that we bought into this plan of being reaccredited as a System and being reaccredited as a level-two institution. I think it would be a tremendous opportunity for us. Many of us embraced it with a great deal of anticipation and excitement, because it did mean a great deal of opening up a lot of doors, that we could see opportunities grow and expand, and really fulfill our missions and meet the needs of our constituents. I think we see that as an opportunity to co-exist with Tech schools as they begin to offer associate degrees. My question is, how's the CHE going to react to this when they realize -- or maybe they already have, although they haven't indicated so -- when we have this level two-to-four institution re-accreditation? We will no longer be level one institutions; we won't be two-year campuses; we're not really now.

Duffy: We don't exist up there. We better get this through our heads and that is, whether we like it or not, by legislation, the CHE has certain amounts of authority, and one of the things is, we did, a couple of years ago, we anticipated it. We knew that we had more than 20, more than 50% of the course offerings at these various campuses, and we put together this tremendous package, which is now going to the Commission, and it will then be followed by a package which relates to Applied Professional Sciences. But you can't just say, here I am, a full-blown learning center; you have to prove it. You've got to convince those people it's worth doing. You've got to convince your own faculty it's worth doing. You've got to convince Columbia faculty it's worth doing. Before the Commission, you've got to do the same job.

Chamberlain: I agree, and I think that's the fight we're fighting for right now. I don't think we gain anything by being negative and turn back the clock and tell Tech they can't have that.

Now, maybe the Legislature will see through that, but I would rather concentrate our efforts on trying to get the next package through CHE and starting out a fight for that, getting those off-campus programs approved.

Duffy: We don't disagree. We've beaten the CHE on several occasions, as a University. We can't go through life doing that. The CHE has certain statutes that give the Commission certain authority. We just can't sit around thumbing our noses at it. We have to sell what we're doing to the Commission. We can't go over to the legislature and say, "Help us. Those bad guys are beating up on us again," because ultimately the Legislature is going to get tired of this. You and I are in total agreement. You have a plan; you have all these proposals in front of the Commission.

Chamberlain: That's right, and they're important because they are our future.

Duffy: I'm not sure that we can't work out...I mean there's a lot of sympathy for Sumter and Beaufort on this issue of duplication, but then, getting back to the other point, we're perfectly willing to listen.

Chamberlain: My next question is, can we count on Columbia to support us in this, from the very beginning and right on through?

Duffy: What are you talking about, "Columbia?" Columbia supported you on the other one. I can't speak for the President. What is Columbia? If you're talking about a state-wide effort that involves the System, yes.

Chamberlain: I want to coordinate all our efforts.

Duffy: I would be disappointed if that were not the case.

REPORT OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR
UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
NOVEMBER 17, 1989
UNION, SC

The Chancellor has requested that I attend a 10:00 a.m. meeting on November 17 in Columbia, the state education policy seminar. The subject of this meeting is the recent action by CHE for altering the degree-granting status of the nine technical colleges. The organizers of this seminar have invited Commissioner Sheheen, Dr. Holderfield (Chancellor Duffy's counterpart at TEC), Bob Alexander of USC-Aiken (USC representative), and Robert Stokes of the Southern Regional Education Board to address the seminar. These seminars are attended by legislators and policy makers and are designed to provide indepth discussions of current issues. I am hopeful that this will be completed in time for me to join you for your 2:00 p.m. general session.

Status of USC-Beaufort Dean Search

The Chancellor has appointed an outstanding search committee which has met once to determine its procedures and timetable. I am chairing this committee and I took the opportunity a. our first meeting to also meet with interested members of the Beaufort family faculty/staff to discuss with them search procedures. We currently have underway a national advertising campaign to solicit applications and they are rolling in daily. We should be able to assemble an outstanding pool of applicants.

Sometime in February we will start the process of bringing applicants to the campus for interviews and to meet all interested faculty and staff. I will keep you posted.

University Campuses Off-Campus Program Proposals to CHE

The off-campus programs we have been operating for many years are currently being reviewed by the Commission on Higher Education. These proposals reached the Commission on November 1 and will be in their cycle to be acted upon at the May 2, 1990 meeting. Chancellor Duffy and/or I will comment verbally at the Senate meeting on preliminary verbal responses from the Commission to Provost Smith on these. We're talking here about the status of the proposals involving USC-Union at Laurens, USC-Beaufort at Hilton Head, USC-Lancaster at Camden, USC-Salkehatchie at Walterboro, Aiken business programs at Sumter and Beaufort, Coastal education program at Sumter, and Aiken education programs at Salkehatchie and Beaufort.

System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee

The Committee will have had its second meeting of the year on November 16. Due to the length of time it takes to prepare this report prior to our meeting on the 17th, I will not be able to include a written report of the **activities** of that meeting. However, you **are represented at that meeting** by your Senate Chair, Professor Cureton. I **believe she can handle this** very well for both of us. The items we will have been discussing are as follows.

Campus representatives will be asked to report on the progress they have made toward full implementation of the policy recommended by the Committee to President Holderman and approved by him in spring 1989, pertaining to the right of an undergraduate student to complete

graduate requirements under the Bulletin that was in effect at the time he or she first entered the USC System in matriculated status.

Undergraduate students are now allowed up to five years of continuous absence within the eight years they have to complete the requirements for their degrees, while claiming the right to graduate under the Bulletin in effect at the time they first entered the USC system in matriculated status. The question is whether this five-year allowance should be modified.

Should the University of South Carolina System continue to maintain a single grading system for all undergraduate programs? If so, by what process might changes in the grading system be made?"

In lieu of the fact that we do not have a System faculty senate this committee takes on extremely important significance to address future System academic articulation issues.

Affirmative Action Officer Search

I chaired a search committee for a number of months which has recently recommended three finalists to the President for his review and selection. We hope to have this matter completed prior to the Christmas holidays and I am optimistic that we will have a new outstanding Affirmative Action Officer to replace the very capable Paula Cox who left us in July to join her husband's move to Rice University in Texas.

Faculty Development Seminar

As part of the CHE-sponsored University Instructional Development Project to enhance the training of graduate teaching assistants at USC-Columbia (this project is jointly administered by John Gardner, George Reeves, and Mike Welsh), we are bring in a faculty development expert to speak to interested faculty. You are, **therefore, invited to attend this on** December ~ at 2:30 p.m. in **Gambrell Hall, Room 153. Our speaker will be Robert M. Diamond, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Instructional Development and Director of the Center for Instructional Development, Syracuse University.** The title of his address will be "Teaching, Research, Rhetoric, and Reality." This address is also being sponsored by **the Office of the Provost and will be followed** by a reception.

Diamond holds an A.B. in economics from Union College and an M.A. and Ph.D. in Education from New York University. His major **professional focus** has been on the systematic improvement of instruction in higher education. He has directed course and curriculum design, implementation, and evaluation programs at San Jose State University, the University of Miami, and Syracuse University. A Senior Fulbright Lecturer to India in 1976, he was selected as a **distinguished faculty** member for the State University of New York Scholar Exchange Program in 1969. Diamond has written extensively in the area of curriculum design and instructional development. His most recent book is a 1989 Jossey-Bass publication entitled *Designing and Improving Courses and Curricula in Higher Education*.

In addition to his work in instructional improvement, Diamond has developed and implemented a model program of TA training on the Syracuse campus. In 1987, Diamond and Peter Gray co-authored a National Study on Teaching Assistants. In September of this year, the national study instrument was used at USC to survey graduate TAs about their teaching responsibilities, preparation, and perceived needs. While on the USC-Columbia campus, Diamond will meet with the Advisory Board to the University's grant-funded TA training project and will present the results of the TA survey to graduate directors, deans, and department chairpersons.

January University 101 Faculty Training Workshop

This is to ask you to invite any of your new colleagues or perhaps not-so-new colleagues who have not yet been through the University 101 faculty training to do so. The next workshop will be held January 2-5, 1990 at USC-Columbia. This office will cover travel and subsistence costs.

Proposed Tuition Assistance Plan for Faculty/Staff

As has been discussed previously with this group, the University is presently designing a proposal to send to the State Human Resources Division for approval--a proposal which would provide University support for college tuition for University faculty/staff to take job-related courses. It would permit them to take one course per term. The proposal is now in the President's Office for final review before forwarding to the state level. We will keep you informed as to how it fares. System Vice President Jameson and her staff deserve much credit for keeping this important concept alive and moving it forward!

Proposal for Reciprocal Tuition Agreement with Contiguous Georgia Counties

As some of you may be aware, the state of Georgia for some time has permitted South Carolina/Alabama/Florida residents whose counties border on the state of Georgia to attend Georgia state institutions and pay in-state fees. This has had some impact on USC-Aiken, USC-Salkehatchie and USC-Beaufort. Currently, our legislative liaison personnel are discussing with legislative budget writers the possibility of introducing a proviso in the next session of the General Assembly that would permit also South Carolina state institutions to offer such reciprocal tuition agreements. Obviously, this could impact favorably on several of the University Campuses. We will keep you informed.

Faculty Exchange Deadline

This is to remind you that the Faculty Exchange deadline is November 17. For those of you who were not aware of this if you would contact me, I believe I can arrange an extension. We do want University Campuses faculty to pursue this opportunity.

October Report of Columbia Faculty Senate Welfare Committee

This is to call your attention to a recent report of the USC-Columbia Faculty Senate Welfare Committee on which the University Campuses are represented. Specifically, as a part of that report, the committee recommended that the University and Four-Year Campuses should not be permitted to alter or expand their missions and/or to engage in what was described as "empire building." Naturally, such language is of concern to this office and we would be pleased to have the Senate clarify with its representative what lead to this recommendation and what can be done to inform the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee so that they will cease to see us as a drain on Columbia resources.

System Retreat for Business, Computing and Personnel Officers

The Office of the Chancellor is working with the System offices for personnel, computer services, and business and finance, to organize a retreat for December 1-3 to bring together many of the campus-based personnel in these three critical areas for the first time. The purpose of this meeting will be to bring together from all nine campuses not only the chief business/computing/personnel office but as many of the support staff as possible who are essential to the effective delivery of critical support functions; to meet needs for increased efforts to network; share information and technology; increase collegiality, as well as have opportunities for open-ended network sharing,

problem-solving discussion; to listen to non-Columbia personnel's many useful views and opinions on problems, challenges and opportunities; and to generate agendas for future discussion of issues and problems and provide System-level university officers valuable input into the planning and development of future policies. We are extremely optimistic that this will be a useful meeting that will bring positive results to the five University Campuses.

Hurricane Hugo Budget Impact

To state it quite simply, all of you who read the South Carolina press reports as to the economic impact of Hurricane Hugo probably know as much about its potential impact on state government-funded **activities** as does the Chancellor and/or I. I assume you have all read in The State newspaper about the latest economic forecast being given to the State Budget and Control Board to the effect that the state's economy is projected to grow at a 6% annual growth rate for the 1990-91 fiscal year with an anticipated additional new state revenues, in spite of Hurricane Hugo, of some \$170,000,000. As for how that will be sliced up for higher education vis a vis other agencies we, of course, cannot tell you. But we do know that we have a number of supporters in the General Assembly who are doing their best to increase the extent of formula funding for us for the coming year. In the meantime, it remains very unclear as to what the impact of Hurricane Hugo will be on this year's state budget. There have been rumors of the possibility of mid-year budget cuts and an indication that there have been some differences of opinion in the General Assembly as to whether it should ask state agencies to take budget cuts before going into the State Reserve Fund. Again, no official information has been provided on this and we do not wish in any way to contribute to pointless speculation or rumoring at this time. We regret that we cannot be more informative to you about this matter at this time.

Study of Feasibility of System Adult Learner Interdisciplinary Degree

As you know, we have, thanks to the College of Applied Professional Sciences, been able to offer for many years the Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies degree to all of our five campuses. Without that, we would have no mechanism for the true adult learner to fulfill baccalaureate-level aspirations. In light, however, of the recent CHE opposition to what the University Campuses stand for, there is some feeling that we need to go on the offensive to further differentiate our mission from those of the state's technical colleges. One way to do this might be to create our own System adult learner degree which we could offer in addition to the BAIS. The Chancellor's office has asked the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to consider appointing a faculty committee or using one of the standing committees to consider the feasibility of such a degree for the University Campuses. The idea is not necessarily to reinvent the wheel but to make a survey of possible models currently existing elsewhere in American higher education and then to determine how they might be adapted appropriately to our University Campuses needs. If we should develop a proposal that were to be approved by our Senate, naturally, it would need then to go to the USC-Columbia Curricula and Courses Committee and then on to the USC-Columbia Senate, Administration, and Board, and then finally to CHE for review and approval. So at the very best, this is a long, time-consuming process indeed. In the meantime, we are extremely fortunate to have the BAIS which, incidentally, must be submitted to CHE for review and in all probability will enter their May 1990 cycle for action upon by the Commission in November of 1990. The University has submitted a letter of intent to submit this program for review because the Commission has requested this and at present Richard Mims, Don Stowe, and I are working on a draft proposal for informal review by CHE officers.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S.C. 29208

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Swearingen Engineering Center Office of the Dean

MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Senate
From: E. G. Schwartz ~
Chairman, Savannah River Review Committee
Subject: Annual Report

April 24, 1989

This committee was formed by action of the Faculty Senate at its meeting of June 16, 1988. It was subsequently expanded by action of the Steering Committee to include a member elected by the Aiken Campus Faculty and a member elected by the Two Year Faculty Senate. The purpose of the committee is to review the relationship between the University and the new contractor at the Savannah River Site. That relationship was to be conducted through a consortium of South Carolina Universities. The committee met a total of seven times through the course of the year.

Over the last year, we can report that little more than the development of a framework for future relations has been put in place. A foundation, the South Carolina Universities Research and Education Foundation was formed in November, 1988. The original members of the foundation were the University of South Carolina, Clemson University, and the Medical University of South Carolina. We have been told that South Carolina State College will soon join the foundation. Westinghouse, as the new site contractor, is currently in negotiation with the foundation to identify the nature of future joint ventures. It is reported that the three principal areas of interest are technology transfer, waste management, and the distinguished scientist program. The proposed exclusive non-competitive research relationship, rejected by the general faculty in May, 1988 is no longer part of the negotiations.

The committee remains open to faculty concerns. During the course of the year, we did consider one case of possible abuse of academic freedom but found insufficient evidence for action or recommendation. The committee recognizes the possibility that members of the faculty of the Aiken Campus, because of their proximity to the site, may be particularly subject to pressures resulting from the relationship with the Savannah River Site.

MEMORANDUM

To: Savannah River Review Committee

David Cowen	Hal French
Paul Huray	Peter Sederberg
Bill Lamprecht	Timir Datta
Stanley Rich	

From: E. G. Schwartz

Subject: Minutes of November 3 Meeting

Date: November 6, 1989

-

With French and Sederberg not attending, the rest of us discussed the following:

The letter from Prof. Vander Kolk. It was generally agreed that no response was necessary but that we would ask Prof. Sederberg to maintain informal contact.

The Chronicle article on the University of Nevada and Yucca Mountain waste repository. Certain similarities in their situation and ours were noted.

Paul Huray reported the following activities of SCUREF.

A new state tax on the receipt of hazardous wastes is expected to generate from \$600,000 to \$1,000,000 annually which is to support research in SCUREF. Doug Dobson is to chair a policy committee for the use of these funds.

b. There is confidence that a "Center of Creativity" will be funded by DOE at a rate of 2 million dollars per year for 5 years. This is to include the Distinguished Scientist Program which will ultimately support 8 positions at USC, Clemson, and MUSC.

Westinghouse has provided a \$2,000,000 grant for three years in support of parallel computing.

Stanley Rich described an "Instructional Needs Survey" that the USC Aiken Campus is planning to conduct with employees of the Savannah River Site. He also discussed a general uneasiness concerning assignment of faculty to teach courses at the site.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
University Campuses Faculty Senate Meeting

AGENDA

- I. Call To Order
- II. Correction/Approval of Minutes: 15 September 1989
USC-Columbia
Lifelong Learning
Ft. Jackson, SC
- III. Reports from University Officers
 - A. Dr. John J. Duffy, Chancellor
 - B. Professor John N. Gardner, Vice Chancellor
- IV. Reports from Standing Committees
 - A. Rights and Responsibilities - Professor John Logue
 - B. Welfare - Professor Mary Barton
 - C. System Affairs - Professor Paul Stone
- V. Executive Committee - Professor Rick Boulware
- VI. Reports from Special Committees
 - A. University Library Committee - Professor John Catalano
 - B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses - Professor Robert Castleberry
 - C. University Faculty Welfare Committee - Professor Don Curlovic
 - D. Academic Planning Committee - Professor Bruce Nims
 - E. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee - Professor Rod Sproatt
 - F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee - Professor Tandy Willis
 - G. Savannah River Site Committee - Professor W. O. Lamprecht, Jr.
 - H. System Academic Policy Coordinating Committee - Professor Robert Costello
 - I. Other Committees
 - 1. Insurance and Annuities Committee - Professor Jerry Dockery
 - 2. Affirmative Action Committee - Professor Deborah Cureton
- VII. Unfinished Business
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Announcements
- X. Adjournment