

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
USC Columbia

Friday, February 19, 1993

Coffee----- 9:30-10.00 a.m.
Daniel Management Center Reception Area

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

Welcome
Dr. Richard Predmore, USC Spartanburg
S.C. Conference of University Faculty Chairs
Reports from Special Committees

Standing Committees-----10:45-12:30 p.m.

- I. Rights and Responsibilities
Room 857
- II. Welfare
Room H
- III. System Affairs
Room K

Executive Committee-----10:45-12:30 p.m.
Room A

Deans Meeting-----10:45-12:30 p.m.
Board Room

Luncheon-----12:30- 1:45 p.m.
Top of Carolina, Capstone

Afternoon Session----- 2:00- 3:30 p.m.
Room A

Reception----- 3:30- 5:00 p.m.
HRTA Dining Room, Capstone

AGENDA

- I. Call To Order
- II. Correction/Approval of Minutes: November 20, 1992
USC Union
Union
- III. Reports from University Officers
 - A. Dr. John J. Duffy, Vice Provost
 - B. Professor John N. Gardner, Associate Vice Provost
 - C. Deans of the Regional Campuses
- IV. Reports from Standing Committees
 - A. Rights and Responsibilities - Dr. Danny Faulkner
 - B. Welfare - Professor Dr. Salvador Macias
 - C. System Affairs - Dr. Robert Costello
- V. Executive Committee - Professor John Catalano
- VI. Reports from Special Committees
 - A. University Library Committee - Professor John Catalano
 - B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses -
Dr. Robert B. Castleberry
 - C. University Faculty Welfare Committee - Dr. Susan Pauly
 - D. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee -
Professor Kay Oldhouser
 - E. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee -
Dr. Mary Barton
 - F. Savannah River Site Committee - Professor John Logue
 - G. Other Committees
Insurance and Annuities Committee - Professor Jerry
Dockery
- VII. Unfinished Business
 - A. Ad Hoc Committee to study models of system, governance,
and curriculum
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Announcements
- X. Adjournment

**THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
USC COLUMBIA
FEBRUARY 19, 1993**

Morning Session

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Tandy Willis. He expressed regrets from Chairperson Carolyn West for not being able to attend because of illness. He then stated that the order of business on the agenda had been rearranged and he recognized our guests.

Dr. Richard Predmore, USC-Spartanburg, then addressed the Senate concerning the Conference of S.C. University Faculty Chairs. (See Attachment 1). Dr. Predmore discussed actions taken and plans made by this group. Conference members have had three meetings and agreed that the group should be a continuing effort even if they get beyond the stage of influencing the appropriations process and even if the level of funding rises to a level with which everyone is comfortable. They agreed that the organization still has a role to play (e.g., supporting issues such as faculty benefits). They also discovered that although the administrators could tell them the numbers in the percent of the formula, the faculty are the ones who know what that translates into in terms of what is going on in the classrooms. Thus the faculty voice is a distinct one that needs to be heard. They all agreed that the situation on their campuses is very close to the point where serious damage will be done to classroom activities due to persistent shortfalls.

Dr. Predmore encouraged participation and direct faculty communication with our legislators in Columbia.

Afternoon Session

The minutes of the November 20 meeting at USC-Union were approved as distributed.

Professor Willis announced the completion of the publication and distribution of The University of South Carolina Regional Campuses Faculty Senate-Its First Twenty-Five Years by Nancy Washington. He thanked Professor Washington on behalf of the whole Senate for this fine effort. Copies are available on each campus in the library.

Reports from University Officers:

Vice Provost & Executive Dean for Regional Campuses & Continuing Education

Dr. Duffy's report was distributed (See Attachment 2). Mrs. Hall's committee which visited all campuses was responsible for preparing the new mission statement (See Executive Committee Report below) at the Board of Trustees retreat last month.

Associate Vice Provost for Reg. Campuses & Cont. Ed.

Professor Gardner's report was distributed (See Attachment 3). He pointed out the correct spelling of Susan Moskow's name.

Reports from the Deans of the Regional Campuses:

Dean Plyler of Beaufort reported:

- 1) Title III grant is in third year and USC-B is preparing a request for a second grant
- 2) Black History Lecture Series is underway
- 3) The Creative Retirement Center is growing rapidly
- 4) USC-Beaufort is looking forward to hosting the April Senate meeting

Dean Arnold of USCL congratulated the R.C.F.S. on its 25th Anniversary

Dean May of Lifelong Learning reported that his campus is continuing to function despite its meager resources

Dean Anderson of Sumter congratulated the R.C.F.S. on its 25th Anniversary and urged senators to use influence with local legislators to support the cause of higher education and of USC in the state.

Dean Clayton of Salkehatchie reported on the criminal justice program, teacher aid program, FIPSE participants, and his hope that Salkehatchie would gain the contract to teach courses in the new prison.

Dean Edwards of Union discussed their high enrollment and F.T.E. count, student activities, Union's recruitment program, Dr. Moeser's visit, and stated that they had reinstated their Arts Series.

Reports from Standing Committees:

R & R: submitted by Senator Faulkner (See Attachments 4 and 4a)

Welfare: submitted by Senator Macias (See Attachments 5 and 5a)

System- Affairs: submitted by Senator Costello (See Attachments 6 and 6a)

In the discussion concerning the faculty governance proposal on Attachment 6a, Senator Macias expressed the opinion that the proposal was an attempt to cure a problem which is non-existent. Senator Haist called it an exciting proposal. Senator Group wondered if the R.C.F.S. was seeking to diminish its own power. Professor Catalano expressed concern about having four-year campus senators voting on regional campus concerns (e.g. associate programs or T & P concerns). Senator Logue pointed out that no motion we might pass could establish a bicameral senate since the other entities involved would have to sign on to the idea. The motion is to be discussed at the April R.C.F.S. meeting and possibly voted on at that time.

Report from the Executive Committee:

Submitted by Professor Catalano (See Attachment 7)

Reports from Special Committees:

Professor Catalano reported from the University Library Committee (See Attachment 8). Senator Castleberry reported from the University Committee on Curricula and Courses (See Attachment 9). Senator Pauly reported from the University Faculty Welfare Committee (See Attachment 10). Senator Oldhouser reported from the Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee (See Attachment 11). Senator Barton reported from the Research and Productive Scholarship Committee (See Attachment 12). Senator Logue reported from the Savannah River Site Committee (See Attachment 13). There was no report from Insurance and Annuities Committee and Professor Dockery was not present.

Unfinished Business:

Senator Castleberry asked about the location of the report from the T & P Committee which was due at this meeting. Senator Faulkner replied that there had not been enough time and that it would be discussed at the April meeting.

Professor Willis reminded the Senate of the existence of the *ad hoc* committee to establish what constitutes a "meaningful system". He reported that the Executive Committee considered this committee unnecessary for the reason that several other committees throughout the system including our own System Affairs Committee are working on the same issue. Senator Castleberry expressed his belief that the Executive Committee had failed the Senate in not following through regarding motions passed at previous Senate meetings. Professor Catalano expressed his opinion that since Chairperson West had constituted and charged the committee, it was not the Executive Committee which should be viewed as being at fault. At Senator Castleberry's request, a list of committee members is included in these minutes (See Attachment 14).

Announcements:

A reception at Capstone following the business meeting of the Senate will be held to honor the 25th Anniversary of the R.C.F.S. The group then adjourned to Capstone at which time Dr. Duffy made remarks concerning the Senate (See Attachment 15). Dr. Duffy and Dr. Palms were presented the first two copies of Professor Washington's book.

The next Senate meeting will be April 15-16, 1993 in Beaufort.

R.C.F.S.**Attendance—February 19, 1993****EXEC. COMM.:*****Carolyn West- Chair (Absent)***

Tandy Willis- Vice-Chair

John Catalano- Secretary

Mike Schoen- At Large

Wayne Chilcote- At Large

Rick Boulware- Past Chair

S.A.C.:**Robert C. Costello- USC-Sumter (Chair)**

Steve Buchanan- USC-Union

David Bowden- Lifelong Learning

Steve T. Anderson- USC-Sumter

Stephen T. Bishoff- USC-Sumter

Ben Robertson- USC-Lancaster

Ralph Garris- USC-Lancaster (Absent)***Ellen Chamberlain for Jane Upshaw- USC-Beaufort***

Roy Darby- USC-Beaufort

Bill Bowers- USC-Salkehatchie

Marvin Light- USC-Salkehatchie

WELFARE:**Salvador Macias- USC-Sumter (Chair)**

Mary Barton- USC-Union

Nancy Washington- Lifelong Learning

James E. Privett- USC-Sumter

John T. Varner- USC-Sumter

Noni Bohonak- USC-Lancaster

Susan Pauly- USC-Lancaster

Nora Schukei- USC-Beaufort

Duncan McDowell- USC-Salkehatchie

R & R:**Danny Faulkner- USC-Lancaster (Chair)**

Dan Snow- USC-Union

Cleta Dunaway- Lifelong Learning

Charles K. Cook- USC-Sumter

Robert Castleberry for Jean E. Gray- USC-Sumter

John F. Logue- USC-Sumter

Dianne Evans- USC-Lancaster

Bruce Nims- USC-Lancaster

Gordon Haist- USC-Beaufort

Sally LaPoint- USC-Beaufort (Absent)

Bob Group- USC-Salkehatchie

Paul Stone- USC-Salkehatchie

Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Chairs

Founding Statement of Goal, Purposes and 1993 Plan of Action

(Draft for discussion at a Conference Meeting on February 12, 1993)

The Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Chairs is composed of the elected faculty chairs at all public universities in South Carolina. It was founded in December, 1992 with a goal to provide a strong faculty voice advocating for public higher education in the State of South Carolina. The specific purposes of the Conference are:

1. to exchange information on matters of mutual interest among the faculties of member institutions;
2. to make representations to university administrations, the Commission on Higher Education, legislators and legislative bodies and other public officials in furtherance of the goal of the Conference;
3. to inform the news media and public-at-large on the necessity and value of a strong commitment to public higher education;
4. to undertake other activities deemed appropriate by the Conference and its Executive Committee in furtherance of the goal of the Conference.

The full Conference meets at least twice each year and more often as necessary. An Executive Committee, representative of the diversity of public universities in the State, meets in the interim.

At its second meeting, held in early January, 1993, the Conference concluded that the first priority should be given to direct advocacy for increased support for higher education in the State of South Carolina. It was the unanimous conclusion of the Conference that during the past several years declining legislative and executive support for higher education had begun a process seriously eroding the fabric of higher education in South Carolina. Decreased state assistance and commitment continues to cause excessive tuition and fee hikes, deferred maintenance on physical facilities, a shortage of laboratory and computer equipment including software, a shortage of classroom and office space, inadequate library space, book holdings and specialized journals, inadequate faculty resources and excessive reliance on part-time faculty, overcrowded classrooms, disincentives for high quality out-of-state students decreasing the diversity of the student body, and more restricted access to a university education for South Carolina students who, if they leave the state for higher education, are likely to be lost to the future of the state forever.

This background of the erosion of the fabric of higher education amounts to living off of your capital. Once it is used up, there is nothing left. This will happen to South Carolina unless the state legislature and other elected officials acknowledge the necessity of increasing support for higher education in South Carolina.

From the perspective of the Faculty Chairs in 1993, public university education in South Carolina is at a crossroads. Down one road is more of the same as in the recent past and therefore continuing erosion and decline and with it a depressed and depressing future for every single South Carolinian. Down the other road is a commitment to establishing public university education as a priority of the first order. The Conference believes that the elected executive and legislative officers of this State will choose the second road and with it a brighter and growing future for every citizen and for the State as a whole. As a result, the Conference will work through all appropriate means to achieve that goal.

**REPORT OF THE VICE PROVOST
REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
February 19, 1993**

MOVE TO CAROLINA PLAZA

The first of the division offices will begin moving in April. All offices should be in place by June.

CHE FORMULA RECOMMENDATION AND BUDGET STATUS FOR NEXT YEAR

Attached. As you can see the budget picture is not very promising for Columbia or the campuses.

TWO-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY

John R. Arnold of USC Lancaster has been appointed to the CHE's study of two-year higher education. He, George Reeves and Bob Alexander are among the eleven members of the Technical Group of the committee, coordinated by Gail Morrison, Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs for the CHE. In addition, there is a smaller Policy Group, which includes Lily-Roland Hall; William Hubbard is the Chairman of the committee.

"In creating the Committee, the Commission has charged it to examine every aspect of the function of the public two-year institutions with a view toward determining the future of two-year public postsecondary education in the State. The approach of the Commission to this study is one of openness with regard to its substantive outcomes."

The Committee has listed five major goals:

1. Increase access to groups which historically have been denied higher education;
2. Promote excellence which can be demonstrated in learning outcomes;
3. Contribute through their academic programs significantly to the economics progress of the State and the health and cultural developments of its citizenry;
4. Develop a flexible system of delivery which includes distance learning through advanced technology; and
5. Accomplish all objectives within a framework of fiscal responsibility and the elimination of unnecessary duplication at all levels.

Further the Technical Group has been charged to focus on three broad questions:

1. What are the purposes and goals which were established under the enabling legislation for both two-year systems? Is the original purpose in keeping with today's needs? If not, what should the purpose be?
2. What are the benefits or shortcomings accruing from a unique system of technical colleges and a system of five two-year branch campuses of USC? Their assets and liabilities?
3. Is there unnecessary duplication between the two-year education systems? If so, how can it be minimized?

In response to these charges, the Technical Group has been meeting on about an every-other-week basis through January and February, with a joint session with the Policy Group held on February 1, 1993. The final report is due by December, 1993.

Much of the work to this point has consisted of gathering information, including pertinent reports and studies, with detailed consideration of governance models in operation in other states. The next meeting is scheduled on February 23, 1993.

DEAN SEARCHES AT SUMTER AND UNION

These searches are now underway. A list of each committee's members is attached.

PRESIDENT AND PROVOST VISITS TO THE CAMPUSES

John Gardner accompanied Provost Moeser on a campus visit to USC Union on January 26. John Duffy accompanied both President Palms and Provost Moeser to USC Lancaster on January 29. Both visits included meetings with students, faculty, staff, and community members.

Both Gardner and Duffy were impressed by the Campuses' presentations.

SYSTEM MISSION STATEMENT

I call to your attention the mission statement (attached) which has been approved by the Board.

REVISED DRAFT

MISSION STATEMENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA SYSTEM

The primary mission of the University of South Carolina, a multi-campus system serving the entire State of South Carolina, is the education of the state's diverse citizens through its endeavors of teaching, research or creative activity, and service.

TEACHING

The University is committed to providing its students with the highest-quality education, including the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for success and responsible citizenship in a complex and changing world. A particular strength of an education at the University of South Carolina is the excellence, breadth, and diversity of the institution's faculty.

RESEARCH

Convinced that research and scholarship, including artistic creation, are essential for excellent teaching, the University aggressively pursues an active research and scholarship program. The University is dedicated to using research to improve the quality of life for South Carolinians.

SERVICE

Another important facet of the University's public mission is service – to its community, state, nation, and the world in such areas as public health, education, social issues, economic development, and family support systems.

Founded in 1801 in Columbia, the University of South Carolina educated the state's citizens for well over a century before extending its community statewide in the 1950s and 1960s. At that time, a network of campuses was established in response to community initiative and support for accessible, affordable educational programs principally for local citizens. In the 1970's, the Aiken, Conway (Coastal Carolina), and Spartanburg campuses were granted the authority to award baccalaureate degrees. In 1991, the five regional campuses, in Beaufort, Lancaster, Allendale (Salkehatchie), Sumter, and Union - each previously accredited separately - were accredited as parts of the central University institution. While the regional campuses, the senior campuses, and the Columbia campus all pursue teaching, research, creative activity, and service, they do so with an emphasis suited to their individual campus missions.

THE COLUMBIA CAMPUS

As a major teaching and research institution, the Columbia campus has long offered a full range of undergraduate and graduate programs through the doctoral level. With a comprehensive mission of teaching, research, and service, the Columbia campus addresses the state's needs for master's level, professional, doctoral and doctor of philosophy education, for conducting and sharing research, and for responding to statewide and regional demands for educational resources and professional expertise.

The flagship institution of the system, the Columbia campus aspires to national and international stature as it provides equitable access to the full range of its opportunities, resources, and activities.

SENIOR CAMPUSES

Individually accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Aiken, Coastal, and Spartanburg take as their primary mission the delivery of basic undergraduate education to their respective service areas. These senior campuses also offer graduate-level coursework through the University's Graduate Regional Studies program and sometimes offer master's degree programs in response to regional demand.

REGIONAL CAMPUSES

The regional campuses in Beaufort, Lancaster, Allendale (Salkehatchie), Sumter, and Union principally provide the first two years of undergraduate education, including selected associate degree programs mainly for their respective geographic areas. The regional campuses also provide for the completion of bachelor degrees by offering selected upper-division coursework in conjunction with the Aiken, Coastal, Columbia, and Spartanburg campuses as well as some graduate education through the University's Graduate Regional Studies program. In addition to providing these programs, the regional campuses bring the resources of the entire University system to citizens throughout the state.

2/12/93

1993-94 FORMULA APPROPRIATION
 CHE STAFF ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATION

INSTITUTION	1993-94	1992-93	1992-93	ALLOCATED	PERCENT	ALLOCATED BY	PERCENT	COUNCIL	PERCENT	COLUMN 6
	FULL-FORMULA		APPROPRIATION	PERCENT						
	FUNDING		FORMULA	FORMULA	FORMULA	CHE STAFF	FORMULA	PRESIDENT	FORMULA	COLUMN 8
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
CFRDEI	\$17,593,769	\$12,574,924	75.10%	\$11,645,071	66.19%	\$12,127,788	68.93%	\$12,296,054	69.09%	(\$168,266)
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY	125,101,584	78,417,100	67.14%	82,802,998	66.19%	79,516,043	63.56%	79,733,478	63.73%	(217,435)
COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON	32,224,018	20,946,734	68.61%	21,329,158	66.19%	20,932,256	64.96%	21,057,716	65.35%	(125,460)
FRANCIS MARION COLLEGE	16,362,946	11,731,589	73.85%	10,830,406	66.19%	11,463,222	70.06%	11,461,314	70.04%	1,908
LANDER COLLEGE	10,783,640	7,737,522	72.68%	7,137,541	66.19%	7,567,799	70.18%	7,557,580	70.08%	10,219
S.C. STATE COLLEGE	26,996,515	18,554,173	69.80%	17,868,617	66.19%	18,346,566	67.96%	18,348,638	67.97%	(2,072)
U.S.C. - COLUMBIA	169,429,449	117,133,797	72.05%	112,142,993	66.19%	115,853,817	68.38%	115,637,381	68.25%	216,436
U.S.C. - SCHOOL OF MEDICINE	28,101,985	18,491,667	68.62%	18,600,313	66.19%	18,649,955	66.37%	18,524,380	65.92%	125,575
U.S.C. - Aiken	11,499,422	7,405,229	68.68%	7,611,307	66.19%	7,406,339	64.41%	7,467,109	64.93%	(60,770)
U.S.C. - COASTAL CAROLINA	14,670,175	9,876,034	72.50%	9,709,985	66.19%	9,817,940	66.92%	9,826,291	66.98%	(8,351)
U.S.C. - SPARTANBURG	13,739,191	9,275,830	69.68%	9,093,779	66.19%	9,247,950	67.31%	9,221,282	67.12%	26,668
U.S.C. - BEAUFORT	2,659,719	1,717,884	68.38%	1,760,431	66.19%	1,743,106	65.54%	1,730,661	65.07%	12,445
U.S.C. - LANCASTER	3,434,613	2,341,409	68.89%	2,273,323	66.19%	2,335,918	68.01%	2,321,000	67.58%	14,918
U.S.C. - SALKAHATCHIE	2,808,743	1,753,192	66.32%	1,859,068	66.19%	1,791,590	63.79%	1,784,968	63.55%	6,622
U.S.C. - SUMNER	5,080,605	3,228,923	67.55%	3,362,782	66.19%	3,292,614	64.81%	3,269,105	64.34%	23,509
U.S.C. - UNION	1,275,053	890,763	72.80%	843,940	66.19%	880,898	69.09%	876,722	68.76%	4,176
WINTHIOP	23,853,836	18,342,608	75.94%	15,788,522	66.19%	17,553,873	73.59%	17,576,498	73.68%	(22,625)
MEDICAL UNIVERSITY OF S.C.	107,811,581	75,889,204	76.20%	71,358,984	66.19%	74,932,089	69.50%	74,530,663	69.13%	401,426
MEDICAL UNIV. - HOSPITAL	27,260,586	18,132,215	70.58%	18,043,402	66.19%	18,095,345	66.38%	18,105,542	66.42%	(10,197)
AHEC	19,462,880	13,280,626	69.78%	12,882,209	66.19%	12,882,209	66.19%	13,161,196	67.52%	(278,987)
SHFC	177,640,667	106,801,287	66.51%	117,577,804	66.19%	110,085,392	61.97%	110,035,132	61.94%	50,260
TOTAL	\$837,791,777	\$554,522,710	70.37%	\$554,522,710	66.19%	\$554,522,710	66.19%	\$554,522,710	66.19%	(\$0)

Sumter Dean's Search Committee

J. T. Myers, Chair
Porter Adams
Art Bahnmuller
Kwame Dawes
Peter Flanagan
John Gardner
Hayne Painter
Chris Plyler
Thomas Powers
Ben Ross
Carolyn West
James White

Union Dean's Search Committee

Mary MacDonald, Chair
Mary Barton
Alan Charles
Carl Clayton
Leslie Kerr
Ann Stevens
Toccoa Switzer
T. D. Truluck
Tandy Willis

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST
REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
February 19, 1993

Congratulations

This is to congratulate the present and past members of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate upon the occasion of your 25th Anniversary. It has been an honor and a pleasure for me to have been associated with you over the past decade. I look forward to our continuing partnership.

Columbia Future Committee

The Columbia Division of Regional Campuses and Continuing Education is participating in the Future Committee exercise along with all other units at USC Columbia. Our report was submitted on February 15th. We are providing to each of the Academic Deans on the Regional Campuses a copy of our report for any individuals on your campus who would like to review what we submitted. Of course, we eagerly await the response of the Future Committee. We will do our best to make a high priority our support of continuing education opportunities delivered systemwide from Columbia for our campuses.

Faculty Exchange Program

I am pleased to announce that the Faculty Exchange awards for summer 1993 have been awarded to the following faculty: Professor J. T. Myers, USC Sumter; Professor Susan Moskow, USC Salkehatchie; Professor Charles Cook, USC Sumter; Professor Betty Hodges, USC Lancaster; Professor Bruce Nims, USC Lancaster. These proposals were truly outstanding, and I am thrilled that the University has been able to continue this kind of support even in these times of extreme fiscal austerity.

Regional Campuses Faculty Member to Chair Presidential Advisory Committee

For the first time in my recollection in my ten-year history with Regional Campuses, I am pleased to report that one of our faculty colleagues, Professor Deborah Cureton of USC Lancaster, has been appointed by the President as Chair of the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee. This is a committee whose recommendations can have an enormous impact on the welfare of the students, staff and faculty of the entire University System. This is a real first for the Regional Campuses! Such positions historically have been gone to Columbia personnel.

Faculty Retirement Incentive Plan

As was reported in a recent issue of the USC Times, the Board of Trustees will be asked at its February 19th meeting to approve a faculty retirement incentive plan. This action, of course, will have been taken by the time this report is distributed at our own Regional Campuses Faculty Senate meeting. For complete details on this I refer the faculty to information to be published subsequently in the USC Times.

Spring 1993 Enrollment

please see attached report

Tenure and Promotion Process for Regional Campuses

This is to reiterate my clarion call in previous successive years, that this body take action to reevaluate the current tenure and promotion review process. I continue to maintain that there are a number of serious problems in procedure as opposed to criteria. Particularly troublesome to me are the enormous disparities between the quality of the files and the formats on a campus by campus, individual by individual basis. I am not suggesting that Columbia should be the model, but for years there has at least been some kind of standardized format which faculty have used as a benchmark for submission of their files at Columbia. I believe our colleagues on the Regional Campuses desperately need this kind of common coherent structure. A big concern to me continues to be the untenable position that many of our faculty are put in where they are reviewed for a particular action (promotion or tenure) by persons of equal or junior rank to them. This has an inherent potential for conflict of interest. I believe this weakens the standards for the campuses' highest rank, the professorship. A final area of concern for me is the total lack of individual faculty accountability for having to explain and justify their individual votes in terms of the published criteria. I do not believe this gives adequate protection to the rights of the faculty members under review. As always, I would be glad to talk about this to our faculty. In the final analysis, however, this process belongs to the faculty and any recommended change must come from this body.

Annual Freshman Year Experience Conference, February 20-23

As always, Regional Campuses faculty are invited to the annual Freshman Year Experience Conference. This begins tomorrow, Saturday, at the Columbia Marriott and runs through Tuesday, noon. As has been our past practice, you are welcome to attend on a complimentary fee-waived basis any of the academic content sessions of the conference. For information while you are on campus today, just walk across the street to 1728 College Street, the Freshman Year Experience office and get a registration form and other materials. You are both welcome and encouraged to participate.

****1ST OFFICIAL as of 1/22/93****
 (Includes 0.08% Status 3's)
*****FTE Does NOT include**
 Corresp., IJ or GRS***

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ENROLLMENT COMPARISON
SPRING 1992 vs. SPRING 1993

	HEADCOUNT		F.T.E.**		% CHANGE	
	AS OF 1/24/92	AS OF 1/22/93	Sp/Spl AS OF 1/24/92	Sp/Spl AS OF 1/22/93	HD.CT.	F.T.E.
Columbia U/G	14,494	14,508	13,262	13,016	.1	-1.7
Law	766	720	812	768	-6.0	-5.4
D.Pharm.	48	50	48	52		
*Masters			2,727	2,367		-13.2
*Doctoral			1,570	1,533		-2.4
*Total Grad.	9,389	8,858			-5.7	
Sub-Total	24,697	24,136	18,399	17,736	-2.3	-3.6
Aiken	2,920	3,025	2,093	2,176	3.6	4.0
Constat	3,488	3,558	2,849	2,947	2.0	3.4
Spartanburg	3,331	3,287	2,574	2,553	-1.3	-.8
Beaufort	1,050	1,019	489	484	-3.0	-1.0
Lancaster	963	960	566	548	-.3	-3.2
Salkohatchie	827	820	504	516	-.8	2.4
Sunter	1,468	1,388	872	840	-5.4	-3.7
Union	387	377	220	234	-2.6	6.4
Sub-Total	14,434	14,434	10,167	10,298	.0	1.3
TOTAL	39,131	38,570	28,566	28,034	-1.4	-1.9
Med. School: M.D.	264	268	264	268	1.5	1.5
: Ph.D.	50	53	64	69	6.0	7.8
Total Med. School	314	321	328	337	2.2	2.7

**Preliminary D.Pharm. Hdct Included in U/G.

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

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

*GRS Excluded above (Previous = Jan.):

Masters:	610	400	-34.4
Doctorals:	231	193	-16.5
TOTAL GRS	841	593	-29.5

Rights and Responsibilities Committee Report

February 19, 1993

Submitted by Danny Faulkner

We received and reviewed two reports:

- 1) From the subcommittee on tenure and promotion, a guide describing the system T & P process. We are appending this to today's minutes(See Attachment 4a) and we are requesting that senators review this and forward concerns to John Logue or Jerry Dockery right away.

- 2) A rough draft of a composite narrative of the campus reports that we received in November.

We will revise both of these on Thursday evening before our April senate meeting.

AGUIDE TO REGIONAL CAMPUSES TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

1993

INTRODUCTION

The Regional Campuses's Committee on Tenure and Promotions prepared this guide (patterned after A Guide To USC-Columbia Tenure and Promotion Procedures) to provide a description of the tenure and promotion process for the Regional Campuses. This Guide will focus on the organization and operation of the Regional Campuses Tenure and Promotion Committee (RCTP) because most faculty members know little about it. This is a guide to procedures for the operation of the tenure and promotion process on the Regional Campuses and is intended to be descriptive rather than a source authority. In the event of any inconsistency between this document and the tenure and promotion procedures as published in The Regional Campuses Faculty Manual and/or duly established criteria as amended from time to time by the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate, the latter authorities represent the official procedures. Care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of this document but since it is interpretive rather than a controlling authority, the official procedures should be consulted in all doubtful matters. The Guide uses a simple and direct approach and should be easily understandable. The flow chart (Table 1) provides a convenient over-view of the Regional Campuses' tenure and promotion process and may profitably be consulted before reading the guide.

The Guide does not deal with the university's grievance procedure. Interested faculty will find that procedure described at length in The Regional Campuses Faculty Manual.

I. ELIGIBILITY FOR TENURE OR PROMOTION

Each year all non-tenured tenure-track faculty and professional librarians may be considered for tenure, and all tenure-track faculty members below the rank of professor may be considered for promotion. (Application, however, should be consistent with the time constraints imposed by the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual.) The Dean, or the Dean's designated academic administrator will write to each eligible faculty member asking if the individual wishes to be considered

for tenure or promotion. Each campus will consider and vote on all eligible faculty members except those who, in writing, waive consideration until the following year. Each campus must consider a faculty member in the penultimate year of his or her probationary appointment (fifth year for an assistant professor and third year for a faculty member appointed at the rank of associate professor).

II. PROCEDURES AT THE CAMPUS LEVEL

A. Notification

The dean or the dean's designated academic administrator shall notify each faculty member eligible for promotion or tenure that he or she should file written intent of application for promotion and/or tenure. The notice must be in writing and must be sent at least one month before the candidate's file is to be considered by the campus tenure and promotion committee. This provision is to allow time for the compilation of information for the tenure and promotion process. Subject to the conditions below, information required by the tenure and promotion process and information selected by the applicant to support her or his application shall constitute a tenure and promotion file.

B. Files

1. A promotion and tenure file will be started at the time a faculty member is hired. This file will include hiring dates, rank, penultimate dates for tenure consideration and such review forms as dictated by campus and system policy. The file will be maintained in the office of the campus academic dean.
2. The candidate bears primary responsibility for preparation of the promotion and /or tenure files on which decisions will be based. Documents mandated by campus policy, such as peer review forms, administrative reviews, etc., will be delivered to the Academic Dean by the originating authority for placement in the candidate's file.
3. Files should not exceed 25 typed pages excluding materials added by the various levels of review. The candidate may also prepare a reference collection of documents (books, other publications, copies of grant proposals, student evaluations, etc.) which will not be duplicated but will accompany the T&P file through the various levels of review. The reference collection of materials will be returned to the candidate at the end of the review process.
4. Each file should contain these items when relevant to the criteria and to the candidate under consideration:

- a) Evaluations and/or evidence of effectiveness as a teacher and/or librarian;
- b) Evidence of research and/or scholarship which may include a list of publications, papers presented, grant proposals, and the like;
- c) As appropriate, evidence of creativity or performance in the arts;
- d) Evidence of professional growth and experience which may include workshops, seminars, additional coursework, participation in professional societies, participation in interdisciplinary education and research activities and the like;
- e) Evidence of campus and system activities such as work on department, division, campus and university committees;
- f) Evidence of community service especially if it relates to the candidate's discipline and reflects well on the university;
- g) Experience at the University of South Carolina;
- h) Relevant experience elsewhere;
- i) External evaluations of a candidate's scholarly or creative achievements and other professional activities received by the candidate, department, division or campus.

5. Apart from materials specified by campus and system tenure and promotion policies, only letters written from other university faculty members to faculty reviewers and materials provided by the candidate may be added to the file. Except for those items specified in paragraph 8 of this section, the file must be complete before the campus begins its review.

6. Neither the candidate nor any other person may bar or remove any relevant document or other evidence from a file.

7. No faculty member other than the candidate or an authorized reviewer may require that any document or other evidence be included in the file, but faculty members may cite or quote from any evidence not in the file in their vote justifications or in separate letters to their dean or unit chair. Such letters and justification will be placed in the file.

8. Letters written by outside reviewers or faculty members in previous years are not automatically included in the file. The candidate or a reviewer may include such a letter in the file but is encouraged to seek the author's

permission.

9. Instruments or mechanisms authorized by the local campus for evaluating a candidate's teaching will be included in the file, including such items as peer and student evaluations. All such evidence shall be organized in reverse chronological order. The candidate or a reviewer may include other evidence of teaching effectiveness.

10. After the campus review process begins, only the following items may be added to the file:

a) Campus tenure and promotion vote and justifications, statements from the dean and other academic administrators which accompany the file to the next steps of the procedure.

b) The votes and justifications of the members of the RCTP.

c) If referred to in the file, material information arising as a consequence of actions taken prior to the campus vote, for example (i) letters from outside evaluators solicited before but received after the campus vote; (ii) notification of acceptance of a manuscript referred to in the file; (iii) publication of books or articles which had been accepted prior to the unit vote; and (iv) published reviews of a candidate's work which appear after the unit vote.

d) Information received by the RCTP which may not be added to the file under the provisions of this paragraph (8), will not be considered by the RCTP in its deliberations. The RCTP may, however, elect to remand the file with the new information to the campus tenure and promotion committee for reconsideration.

C. Access to Files

1. The university's policy is to provide candidates with the fullest possible access to their files subject to the established rules of confidentiality.

2. Letters from colleagues, administrators, and outside evaluators will be ~~to remain confidential~~ unless explicitly collected with a different understanding BY THE CANDIDATE.

ACCESSIBLE TO THE CANDIDATE →

3. Votes and vote justification of the campus committee and recommendations of administrative officials at the campus level will be revealed to the candidate at or prior to the time the vote and/or recommendations are forwarded to the Vice Provost for Regional Campuses

and Continuing Education.

4. The candidate (unless for tenure consideration in the penultimate year) has the right to remove her or his file from further consideration at any point in the process. Removal will be accomplished through a written request for non consideration by the candidate. The request should be forwarded to the next level in the tenure and promotion process.

5. Deans will have access to the files of candidates from their school or college for the purpose of providing a summary of the reasons appearing for the disposition of the candidacy, including, as appropriate, quotations without attribution. The vice provost must approve such a summary before the dean gives it to the candidate.

D. Voting at the Campus Level

1. Only tenured members of a campus may vote on an application for tenure or promotion. Faculty holding administrative positions (such as chair, dean, provost or president) which enable them to make recommendations on a candidate may not vote on or enter into deliberations about those candidates at the local committee level. Emeriti professors may not vote. A faculty member on leave from a campus which uses a committee of the whole may vote only upon notification to the unit chair or dean of a desire to vote before beginning the leave. The faculty member on leave must also attend the meeting or meetings of the committee to cast a vote.

2. Meetings at which candidates are considered for promotion and tenure are closed to everyone except those eligible to vote on the candidate. A local tenure and promotion meeting may, however, by rule, motion, or invitation of the chair of the meeting, be opened to anyone the body wishes to be present at the meeting and/or be heard. Unit chairs, deans and other administrative personnel (whether or not ineligible to vote because of rank, status, or administrative position) present at unit tenure and promotion meetings should refrain, however, from raising administrative features of any candidacy.

3. Tenured faculty of a campus may review a candidate as a committee of the whole or operate through an elected local committee. No local committee will have fewer than five members. Elected local committees should include both professors and associate professors.

4. Each member of the local tenure and promotion committee shall vote "yes," "no," or "abstain." Where the campus rules do not specify majority, a majority of yes votes among those voting "yes" and "no" shall constitute a favorable recommendation. Absent a special unit rule to the contrary,

abstentions shall not be counted in determining whether the requisite majority for a favorable recommendation has been obtained. Each campus may decide what percentage of the vote constitutes a favorable recommendation. The result of all votes of the local committee and the justifications (including non attributed comments) of the committee members will be included in the file.

5. A written justification of any ballots cast must be provided by each faculty member who voted, either on the ballot itself or on a separate form. Justifications need not be signed, but must be clearly identified as such and must state how the author voted. All such justifications shall be included in the file.

III. PROCEDURES ABOVE THE LOCAL LEVEL

A. Notification of Candidate

The chair of the campus T&P committee shall inform the candidate in writing of the committee's recommendation, vote and vote justification. The candidate will be notified at or prior to the time that the recommendation is forwarded to the dean of the campus. The file, including the ballots, justifications, and the letters of local reviewers (if any), will be forwarded to the dean of the campus. The dean will review the file, add an assessment and recommendation, and forward the file to the vice provost. The vice provost will forward the file to the RCTP.

B. Appeals

Any candidate dissatisfied with a recommendation of the committee may appeal through the process described in the "Grievance Procedure for Denial of Tenure or Promotion" described in the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual.

IV. THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES COMMITTEE ON TENURE AND PROMOTIONS

A. Membership

1. The RCTP is composed of twelve tenured full or associate professors. All are elected; two from each campus and two from Lifelong Learning.
2. If a member must vacate a seat, the tenured members of the local campus other than the person to be replaced elect a qualified faculty member to fill the vacancy.
3. No member shall serve for more than three consecutive years.

B. Responsibilities of the RCTP

1. As a part of its deliberations, the RCTP interprets existing tenure and promotion guidelines and should publicize these interpretations to the system faculty.

2. The RCTP receives from the vice provost all files of faculty and professional librarians being considered for promotion or tenure. The RCTP reviews each file to determine whether it supports the conclusions and recommendations of the campus T&P committees. This review includes an examination of decisions to determine consistency with the criteria published in the Manual. In reviewing files the responsibility of the RCTP is two fold:

a) To verify that criteria used by campus are consistent with the Manual; and

b) To review individual tenure and promotion cases and to recommend to the vice provost for or against tenure or promotion.

4. The basis for voting by individual RCTP members is the material in the file presented to the RCTP and the recommendations by local T&P committee and administrators that accompany it. Members of the RCTP consider only the criteria applicable to the case and are guided by reasonable deference to the votes and rationale of the members of the campus T&P committees, the quality of the material in the files, the quality of the justifications that accompany the votes and administrative recommendations, and the strength of support on the local campus and within the USC system.

5. No person who serves on the local T&P or who is in a supervisory role relative to the candidate, may serve on the RCTP.

6. A Typical RCTP Meeting:

a) Before the meeting, the Vice Provost for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education sends the members of the RCTP the files of all candidates who are seeking either tenure and/or promotion. Committee members are expected to have read all files thoroughly before the meeting. The vice provost will appoint a temporary chair to call the meeting to order and proceed to the first order of business; electing a chair and secretary for the meeting. After the chair and secretary have been elected, an agenda will be agreed upon by the committee which usually consists of agreeing on how to review the files. (Though there is no mandatory procedure, the

usual order is that files for tenure are considered first followed by the files for assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.)

- b) After the review and discussion of each file, the chair calls for the vote on the candidate by secret ballot. Each member votes and writes a few sentences of justification on the ballot. It is strongly suggested that the comments focus on the six areas of evaluation as outlined in the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual however, there is no limit on the candid expressions of support or non support by a committee member. A majority of those voting "yes" and "no" constitutes the recommendation of the RCTP. Voided ballots and abstentions are recorded but are not used to mathematically compute a majority.
- c) The ballots and comments will be collected and counted by the chair. The comments on the ballots may be summarized by the secretary and included on a summary sheet for the candidate's file. (The summary of comments will be approved by the committee for inclusion on the summary sheet.) The summary sheet, containing the results of the local tenure and promotion vote, expressions support or non support from various administrative reviewers at the campus level, the campus dean's recommendations and the RCTP vote and summary comments will be reviewed by the chair for accuracy.
- d) After the summary sheet has been completed and reviewed, the RCTP ballots for each candidate are placed in the candidate's file. The chair then sends the summary sheet and all the files, regardless of the committee recommendation, to the Office of the Vice Provost for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education. A copy of the summary sheet will be available for inspection by committee members in the office of the Vice Provost.
- e) Procedures, rules, and actions of the committee not related to individual files are a matter of record. All other matters, including file contents, and committee discussion of candidates' files, are strictly confidential. Action of RCTP and of all levels of the review process will be publicized to system faculty through the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate at the completion of the annual promotion and tenure process for the system.

V. PROCEDURES AFTER THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TENURE AND PROMOTIONS

If, after reviewing the file, the president favors promotion and/or tenure, a recommendation to that effect will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final action. The appropriate administrative officer will inform the candidate of the president's decision.

VI. REPORT TO REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE

After candidates are notified by the Board of Trustees, a report shall be generated by the office of the Vice Provost for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education which is to include the recommendations of each level of review from unit (campus) reviewers up through the Board of Trustees. The report should be presented at the first fall meeting of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate.

Welfare Committee Report

February 19, 1993

Submitted by Sal Macias

Received salary study report--2 parts

- 1) Salary range for individual faculty member arranged by campus
(\$4000 ranges)
- 2) Frequency tables
 - a) Rank
 - b) Yrs @ USC
 - c) Gender
 - d) Degree
 - e) Rank x gender
 - f) Rank x yrs @ USC
 - g) Rank x degree

Question: Why are deans salaries absent? (It was reported to the R.C.F.S. that this was an inadvertant omission)

Delete discipline table

The following motion was presented:

The salary study is to become an annual report

A) Entire report is to be mailed to

- 1) Faculty chair of each campus**
- 2) Library of each campus**

B) Frequency table attached to minutes of senate meeting

Motion carries unanimously

(See Attachment 5a for frequency table)

Professional development and library reports in progress

Meet night before in April

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY RANK AND FOI SALARY RANGE
 FY1992-1993 REGIONAL CAMPUSES SALARY SURVEY
 AS OF 02/12/93 BASED ON 9MTH EQUIVALENT BASE SALARY

13:

RANGE	RANK				TOTAL
	PROFESSOR	ASSOC PROF	ASST PROF	INSTRUCTOR	
	N	N	N	N	
\$ 6,001 TO \$10,000				1	1
\$14,001 TO \$19,000	1			2	3
\$18,001 TO \$22,000			2	2	4
\$22,001 TO \$26,000			2	9	11
\$26,001 TO \$30,000		5	12	7	24
\$30,001 TO \$34,000	1	28	9	6	44
\$34,001 TO \$38,000	9	20	2	1	32
\$38,001 TO \$42,000	18	8	2	1	29
\$42,001 TO \$46,000	13	1		2	16
\$46,001 TO \$49,999	2			1	3
\$50,000 OR MORE	2				2
TOTAL	46	62	29	32	169

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY YEARS AND FOI SALARY RANGE
 FY1992-1993 REGIONAL CAMPUSES SALARY SURVEY
 AS OF 02/12/93 BASED ON 9MTH EQUIVALENT BASE SALARY

13:02 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY

RANGE	YEARS						TOTAL
	0 TO 5	5 TO 10	10 TO 15	15 TO 20	20 TO 25	25 PLUS	
	N	N	N	N	N	N	
\$ 2,000 TO \$ 6,000					1		1
\$ 6,001 TO \$10,000	1						1
\$14,001 TO \$18,000	2	1					3
\$18,001 TO \$22,000	3	1					4
\$22,001 TO \$26,000	7	2		1	1		11
\$26,001 TO \$30,000	14	5	2	1	2	1	25
\$30,001 TO \$34,000	11	14	9	9	2		45
\$34,001 TO \$38,000	5	6	6	8	7		32
\$38,001 TO \$42,000	2	4	6	13	4		29
\$42,001 TO \$46,000		1	3	8	3	1	16
\$46,001 TO \$49,999			1	2			3
\$50,000 OR MORE		2					2
TOTAL	45	36	27	42	20	2	172

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER AND FOI SALARY RANGE
 FY1992-1993 REGIONAL CAMPUSES SALARY SURVEY
 AS OF 02/12/93 BASED ON 9MNTN EQUIVALENT BASE SAL.

RANGE	GENDER		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
	N	N	N
\$ 2,000 TO \$ 6,000	1		1
\$ 6,001 TO \$10,000		1	1
\$14,001 TO \$18,000	2	1	3
\$18,001 TO \$22,000	2	2	4
\$22,001 TO \$26,000	8	3	11
\$26,001 TO \$30,000	15	10	25
\$30,001 TO \$34,000	26	19	45
\$34,001 TO \$38,000	21	11	32
\$38,001 TO \$42,000	22	7	29
\$42,001 TO \$46,000	14	2	16
\$46,001 TO \$49,999	2	1	3
\$50,000 OR MORE	2		2
TOTAL	115	57	172

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY DEGREE AND FOI SALARY RANGE
 FY1992-1993 REGIONAL CAMPUSES SALARY SURVEY
 AS OF 02/12/93 BASED ON 9MTH EQUIVALENT BASE SALARY

RANGE	EDUC			TOTAL
	MASTER'S	PH.D/ED.D	OTHER	
	N	N	N	
\$ 2,000 TO \$ 6,000	1			1
\$ 6,001 TO \$10,000	1			1
\$14,001 TO \$18,000		3		3
\$18,001 TO \$22,000	3	1		4
\$22,001 TO \$26,000	9		2	11
\$26,001 TO \$30,000	19	5	1	25
\$30,001 TO \$34,000	20	25		45
\$34,001 TO \$38,000	16	16		32
\$38,001 TO \$42,000	10	19		29
\$42,001 TO \$46,000	6	10		16
\$46,001 TO \$49,999	1	2		3
\$50,000 OR MORE		2		2
TOTAL	86	83	3	172

FREQ DISTRIBUTION BY RANK/GENDER AND FOI SALARY RANGE
 FY1992-1993 REGIONAL CAMPUSES SALARY SURVEY
 AS OF 02/12/93 BASED ON 9MTH EQUIVALENT BASE SALARY

13:02 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY

RANGE	RANK											
	PROFESSOR			ASSOC PROF			ASST PROF			INSTRUCTOR		
	GENDER		TOTAL	GENDER		TOTAL	GENDER		TOTAL	GENDER		TOTAL
	MALE	FEMALE		MALE	FEMALE		MALE	FEMALE		MALE	FEMALE	
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		
\$ 6,001 TO \$10,000											1	1
\$14,001 TO \$18,000	1		1							1	1	2
\$18,001 TO \$22,000						1	1	2	1	1	1	2
\$22,001 TO \$26,000						1	1	2	7	2	9	9
\$26,001 TO \$30,000				4	1	5	7	5	12	4	3	7
\$30,001 TO \$34,000		1	1	18	10	28	5	4	9	2	4	6
\$34,001 TO \$38,000	9		9	11	9	20	1	1	2		1	1
\$38,001 TO \$42,000	14	4	18	5	3	8	2		2	1		1
\$42,001 TO \$46,000	11	2	13	1		1				2		2
\$46,001 TO \$49,999	1	1	2							1		1
\$50,000 OR MORE	2		2									
TOTAL	39	8	46	39	23	62	17	12	29	19	13	32

11

FRFG DISTRIBUTION BY RANK/YEARS AND FOI SALARY RANGE
 FY1992-1993 REGIONAL CAMPUSES SALARY SURVEY
 AS OF 02/12/93 BASED ON 9MTH EQUIVALENT BASE SALARY

13:02 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1993 10

RANGE	RANK													
	PROFESSOR						ASSOC PROF						ASST PROF	
	YEARS						YEARS						YEARS	
	0 TO 5	5 TO 10	10 TO 15	15 TO 20	20 TO 25	25 PLUS	0 TO 5	5 TO 10	10 TO 15	15 TO 20	20 TO 25	25 PLUS	0 TO 5	5 TO 10
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
\$ 6,001 TO \$10,000														
\$14,001 TO \$18,000		1												
\$18,001 TO \$22,000													2	
\$22,001 TO \$26,000													1	
\$26,001 TO \$30,000								1	2		1	1	9	2
\$30,001 TO \$34,000				1			3	9	8	6	2		6	3
\$34,001 TO \$38,000	1		1	4	3		3	6	4	4	3		1	
\$38,001 TO \$42,000		1	5	10	2			3	1	2	2		1	
\$42,001 TO \$46,000			3	6	3	1				1				
\$46,001 TO \$49,999				2										
\$50,000 OR MORE		2												
TOTAL	1	4	9	23	8	1	6	19	15	13	8	1	20	5

(CONTINUED)

→ + reduce

FREQ DISTRIBUTION BY RANK/YEARS AND FOI SALARY RANGE
 FY1992-1993 REGIONAL CAMPUSES SALARY SURVEY
 AS OF 02/12/93 BASED ON 9Mnth EQUIVALENT BASE SALARY

13:02 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUAR

RANGE	RANK									
	ASST PROF				INSTRUCTOR					
	YEARS				YEARS					
	10 TO 15	15 TO 20	20 TO 25	25 PLUS	0 TO 5	5 TO 10	10 TO 15	15 TO 20	20 TO 25	25 PLUS
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
\$ 6,001 TO \$10,000					1					
\$14,001 TO \$18,000					2					
\$18,001 TO \$22,000					1	1				
\$22,001 TO \$26,000			1		6	2		1		
\$26,001 TO \$30,000			1		5	1		1		
\$30,001 TO \$34,000					2	2	1	1		
\$34,001 TO \$38,000			1				1			
\$38,001 TO \$42,000		1			1					
\$42,001 TO \$46,000						1		1		
\$46,001 TO \$49,999							1			
\$50,000 OR MORE										
TOTAL		1	3		18	7	3	4		

FREQ DISTRIBUTION BY RANK/DEGREE AND FOI SALARY RANGE
 FY1992-1993 REGIONAL CAMPUSES SALARY SURVEY
 AS OF 02/12/93 BASED ON 9Mnth EQUIVALENT BASE SALARY

12
 13:02 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1993

RANGE	RANK											
	PROFESSOR			ASSOC PROF			ASST PROF			INSTRUCTOR		
	EDUC			EDUC			EDUC			EDUC		
	MASTER- #S N	PH.D./E- D.D N	OTHER N									
\$ 6,001 TO \$10,000										1		
\$14,001 TO \$18,000		1									2	
\$18,001 TO \$22,000						1	1			2		
\$22,001 TO \$25,000						1		1		8		1
\$26,001 TO \$30,000				5			6	5	1	7		
\$30,001 TO \$34,000	1			15	13		2	7		2	4	
\$34,001 TO \$38,000	3	6		12	8		1	1			1	
\$38,001 TO \$42,000	5	13		4	4		1	1			1	
\$42,001 TO \$46,000	4	9			1					2		
\$46,001 TO \$49,999		2								1		
\$50,000 OR MORE		2										
TOTAL	13	33		36	26		12	15	2	23	6	1

System Affairs Committee Report**February 19, 1993****Submitted by R. Costello**

In response to our charge to examine the present structure of faculty governance and make suggestions for change, the System Affairs Committee discussed a proposal to create a USC System Faculty Congress. Copies of this proposal, which was approved by the Committee are available for distribution as this report is presented (See Attachment 6a).

The System Affairs Committee presents the aforementioned motion for discussion by the Senate at this time. Since this is a substantive motion, we request the Chair to place Senate action on the motion on the agenda of the April meeting. Professor Bishoff will distribute copies of the motion and join with me in the ensuing discussion.

We will meet Thursday, April 15 at Beaufort.

Motion:
The Creation of a USC System Faculty Congress

Motion:

To establish a bicameral organization, the USC System Faculty Congress, to represent the faculty members of all of the campuses of the USC System equally according to the details given below.

Rationale:

In response to the changing economic and political needs of the University and the State of South Carolina, Dr. Palms opened the 1992-1993 Regional Faculty Senate Session charging us to join him in the establishment of a more effective and efficient USC System. This motion is an outgrowth of that charge.

Currently, the organizational structure creates the impression, even the reality, of two systems. One exists on the central campus in Columbia; the other around the state. In a practical sense, the larger research component of the Columbia campus does make it distinct from the other campuses. However, the remaining campuses have large variations in elements of their missions that make them as distinct from each other as Columbia is from any one of them. The structure affirms only the two system relationship.

This two system concept promotes:

- a sharp difference in the access to the top administrators particularly during the deliberative phase of any policy decision.
- discouragement of cooperation between the Columbia faculty and the other faculty members even where their missions are congruent.
- blurring of the distinction between the University System and Technical Education System.

Details of the Motion:**Bicameral Congress:**

The bicameral nature of the USC System Faculty Congress would satisfy both the desires of the larger campuses to exert influence and the desires of the smaller campuses to have influence. One house would be filled by three members from each campus. The other would be filled by the relative proportion of the size of the faculty. The total faculty of the smallest campus would have one representative. That ratio would determine the representation of the other campuses, the fraction to be rounded to the nearest whole number.

Each house would elect an executive chair and vice chair to oversee the actions of the house. All four of these individuals would receive reduced teaching loads during their terms in office. Their terms in office will be two years; the chair and vice-chair should serve staggered terms to provide continuity. These individuals would have direct access to the President of the University.

A joint committee would be created to coordinate the activities of the two houses. Members will be elected in equal numbers from each house.

Executive Committee Report

Feb. 5, 1993.

Submitted by: John Catalano

Dr. Duffy discussed:

1. Deans searches
2. Proposed retirement plan
3. Rejection by C.H.E. of its own finance committee proposal to limit funding of 300-400 level courses on our campuses.
4. The ongoing two year study committee of the C.H.E.
5. T & P
6. Planning process

Professor Gardner discussed:

1. T & P concerns
2. Commended Dr. Cureton from USC-L for her election to chair of Affirmative Action Advisory Committee.

Campus reports were brief.

Standing Committee Chairs reported on progress of their primary goals.

1. Welfare--Salary study
2. R & R--T & P study
3. SAC--"Meaningful" system study

Planning for the Feb. 19, 1993 25th Anniversary

Meeting adjourned.

Executive Committee Report

February 19, 1993

Submitted by: John Catalano

We discussed:

- 1) Ad Hoc System Advisory Committee. Carolyn West is supposed to be a member but we do not have information.
- 2) The USC Board of Trustees was in the process of voting on a new system mission statement and the faculty of the regional campuses, as usual, has had no opportunity for input and is apparently out of the loop in the approval process.

The Executive Committee will meet Thursday, April 15, 1993, in Beaufort.

Report from Faculty Senate Library Committee
of meeting held Friday, December 4, 1992
Submitted by John Catalano

1. There was a short general discussion of departmental budget requests.

2. Chairs Report

The Joint Committee on Library Materials Allocations was meeting regularly and should report in the new year. Their discussions included giving budgetary weight to departmental research commitments and indirect-cost recovery, as this committee requested.

3. Vice-Provost's Report

The Provost and Future's Committee had reserved the libraries' materials/book budget from the 12% reduction process, though plans still had to be made for reductions in the rest of the libraries budget. Reductions within the libraries would not be across the board, and were being coordinated by a committee of unit heads. The Provost had also indicated sensitivity to meeting materials inflation, following the serials cuts, perhaps through indexing. Possible enhancements include a request for 1/2% of reduction funds to be reallocated to the libraries, for targeted collection development initiatives. Prof. Scott would write to the Futures Committee indicating Faculty Libraries Committee support for this request.

4. Report on USCAN developments and planning

Mr. Calhoun, University Librarian for Automated Services, reviewed progress and plans, especially concerning the proposed consortium with Clemson and Coastal, and plans for multiple database access through USCAN.

5. Report on new Division of Special Libraries

Dr. Stokes, University Librarian for Special Libraries & Collections, reviewed the constituents, budget, and recent grant successes of the division. He noted the value of the unique collections within the larger library system, ways in which the special libraries serve teaching programs, the development of better guidelines for special acquisitions, and the continuing space needs in division libraries. A major strength of the reorganization has been sharing of expertise between previously separate libraries. Dr. Peters raised the issue of dispersed library collections; Dr. Weir asked about South Carolina College books still in the general stacks; concern was expressed about continued damage to stack items, and conservation needs.

(Thanks to Dr. Scott for allowing me to borrow freely from his minutes of that meeting: I was unable to attend another meeting which was held on Jan. 29, 1993.)

February 19, 1993

TO: University Campuses Faculty Senate
Academic Officers of the Regional Campuses

FROM: Dr. Robert B. Castleberry, Courses & Curriculum
Representative, USC-Sumter **RBC**

RE: Courses & Curricula Meeting of February

Overview:

As you may know, I am the Regional Campuses' Representative on the Columbia based Courses and Curriculum Committee. Maybe one day we will have a System Committee on Curricula, but right now it is just Columbia-based. This Committee makes recommendations to the Columbia Senate; most of the material we process is specific to the Columbia Campus. However, as we make recommendations that might be of interest to the Regional Campuses, I will try to contact the Campus Academic Officers in a timely manner (I am not always successful in this endeavor); these Officers are to pass the information I send on to the appropriate faculty and/or staff on your Campus.

If you have any questions or concerns, or would like a copy of something, just give me a call.

Comment:

SOCY 312: Sociology of Bureaucracy in Modern Society (new course)
RELG 110: Intro. to Religious Studies (new course) is an introduction to the methods of religious inquiry and to the beliefs and practices of major religious traditions.

Current RELG 100 level courses will now be 200 level courses; a 100 or 200 level course is a prerequisite for all other courses.

There were some changes (a few new courses and a few deletions) at the 300 level and above.

MUSC went through a massive renumbering process. MUSC 110 was unchanged.

REMEMBER>>>> Always check the Columbia Senate minutes for final actions (and more details on) all courses and curriculum changes.

Faculty Welfare Committee meeting -- February 1, 1993

1. Provost James Moeser attended the committee meeting and responded to a number of questions presented by the committee members. The committee's questions focused on the proposed early retirement plan, including questions concerning how many faculty might realistically be expected to take advantage of the program and where funding might come from if the expected financial benefits are smaller than those now being projected.

2. Carol Bonet from the Benefits Office was the second guest at the committee meeting. She was concerned with the exact wording of the proposed retirement offer; a few minor changes in wording were discussed and met with general approval. She also fielded questions about possible methods of reducing the cost of health insurance for faculty in the USC system.

3. Other issues before the Welfare Committee were tabled until the March meeting.

Submitted by Susan Pauly
USC-Lancaster



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AT SUMTER

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

Telephone:
(803) 775-6341

February 18, 1993

MEMORANDUM

TO: Regional Campuses Faculty Senate

FROM: Kay Oldhouser *K.O.*

SUBJECT: Faculty Liaison Committee Report

The Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee met Thursday, February 4, 1993. The committee approved several new program proposals including a Master of Education in Elementary Education at USC Aiken. Consideration of one proposal was postponed until correct financial data could be provided. The Provost was asked to design a financial format to be used in all future new program proposals.

The committee received the report from CHE relating to South Carolina's post-secondary institutions. This is the annual report required under A255, and most of the data has already appeared in the newspapers.

The committee also received a report detailing the steps being taken or contemplated to reduce cheating on the Columbia campus.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee is April 22 at USC Beaufort.

February 19, 1993

TO: Regional Campuses Faculty Senate

FROM: Dr. M. Barton *mb*

RE: Research and Productive
Scholarship Committee

This committee has not met this semester. During the November meeting, ^(MBA) a number of research projects were funded. The subcommittee dealing with math, science and engineering tends to be particularly willing to fund reasonable requests from the faculty on the Regional Campuses. I encourage interested faculty to submit an application for funding.

SAVANNAH RIVER REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Savannah River Review Committee (SRRC) met Jan. 12, 1993 with chairman, W.H. Kane presiding. After discussion of concerns including location of the main office of SCUREF (South Carolina Universities Research and Educational Foundation), publication rights, equity of grant distributions and present composition of the Board of Directors of SCUREF, Chairman Kane wrote to Paul Hurray (Vice Provost for Research) and to Ardis Savory (Associate Vice Provost for Research and Director of SPAR).

Dr. Hurray was requested to critique USC's relationship with SCUREF and to discuss such specifics as the location of the main office of SCUREF and the present composition of the Board of Directors. The letter to Ardis Savory requested the following information:

1. a critique of the present SCUREF program, with particular reference to publication rights.
2. a list of grant recipients, by year, from 1988 to date including co-principal investigators. Also, an accounting of all SCUREF funding, school by school - 1988 to present, plus the academic rank of the various grantees so that the committee may tell if younger faculty members are being discriminated against.
3. a review of regulatory issues concerning the location of SCUREF offices.

A good portion of the materials requested have been received and distributed to committee members. The information will be used to prepare a paper for review by the general faculty.

respectfully submitted,
John Logue



Appointed members of the *ad hoc* committee which was constituted to investigate what constitutes a "meaningful" system:

- 1. Tandy Willis
- 2. Deborah Cureton
- 3. John Logue
- 4. Robert Castleberry
- 5. Ellen Chamberlain
- 6. Susan Bridwell
- 7. Dan Ruff

Outline of Remarks on History of the Senate

The Regional Campuses Faculty Senate held its first meeting on January 30, 1968. The Senate is unique in that it was organized by an administrator, the then Provost of the Regional Campuses, William H. Patterson. In its first years it was chaired by Dr. Patterson or his designate. The Senate was established to provide better communication with the faculty of the then eight campus system outside of Columbia. Within four years the Senate evolved into a faculty governance organization with elected officers. The early faculty leaders of the Senate generally came from the larger campuses, such as Florence, Coastal Carolina, and Aiken. Among the early leaders of the Senate were Ray Wilson, a history professor from Aiken; Jack Bates, General Studies professor from Florence; Harry Robinson, a Physics professor from Coastal Carolina; John Edmunds, history professor from Spartanburg; and Sam Greenly of Beaufort. The first woman chair of the Senate was Carolyn Wynn from USC Spartanburg, 1974-75. High ranking members of the Columbia administration regularly met with the Senate to listen to and discuss their concerns.

In its early days the Senate was concerned with the establishment of the Associate degree curriculum and the implementation of special programs, such as the branch program which admitted students who did not meet the normal Columbia admission standards. The Senate also concerned itself with issues of faculty welfare, particularly teaching loads and salaries. Faculty salaries through the period generally increased. The largest salary increases occurred in the first years of the Holderman administration. Regular salary studies have been formalized and have been used by the administration (when funds were available) to attempt to establish some degree of equity within the system. The Senate produced the first Regional Campuses Faculty Manual. It is noteworthy that it took three years for that manual to come into being.

The Senate consistently dealt with the issue of equity and library usage for Regional Campuses faculty until 1977. At that time this issue was decided, due to the intervention of President Holderman, in favor of the campuses. The issue of communications among the campuses, particularly between the Regional Campuses and Columbia is reflected throughout the history of the Senate. It is noteworthy that for many years, Professor Stephen Ackerman served as chairman of the Columbia Faculty Senate, and met regularly with the Regional Campuses Senate. An additional consistent theme has been the underlying issue of the external pressures from the Commission on Higher Education to remove the Regional Campus system from the University of South Carolina.

The Senate also has concerned itself over the years with the issue of student movement among the campuses. This is an ongoing process, but it is noteworthy that it was the Senate that

influenced the office of the Vice Provost to take a proactive rather than a reactive stance in this area.

The Senate has certainly lived up to its purpose of keeping the Columbia administration in touch with the aspirations of senators throughout the system. The Senate has just successfully completed a revision of the Faculty Manual and has strengthened the tenure and promotion system; efforts in these areas are ongoing. The support of the Senate for the on-line catalog system played a major role in having that implemented within the university.

There are certain concerns of the Senate that remain constant, and it is not surprising that communications among campuses and with Columbia are still the subject of ongoing discussion. The Senate should play a major role in assisting the administration of the campuses and of the Columbia administration in the setting of budget priorities over the next few years. The Senate continues to emphasize the interdependence of the campuses of the University of South Carolina System.

In reviewing the record, one is struck by the fact that the Senate has proved to be an excellent training ground for the development of academic administrators within the university system. A review of the list of Senate chairs shows that several individuals have moved into academic administration, while maintaining their roles in the classroom. The Senate has been extremely useful as a forum for the President and the Provost of the University in the formulation and presentation of university policy systemwide.

Further the Technical Group has been charged to focus on three broad questions:

1. What are the purposes and goals which were established under the enabling legislation for both two-year systems? Is the original purpose in keeping with today's needs? If not, what should the purpose be?
2. What are the benefits or shortcomings accruing from a unique system of technical colleges and a system of five two-year branch campuses of USC? Their assets and liabilities?
3. Is there unnecessary duplication between the two-year education systems? If so, how can it be minimized?

In response to these charges, the Technical Group has been meeting on about an every-other-week basis through January and February, with a joint session with the Policy Group held on February 1, 1993. The final report is due by December, 1993.

Much of the work to this point has consisted of gathering information, including pertinent reports and studies, with detailed consideration of governance models in operation in other states. The next meeting is scheduled on February 23, 1993.

DEAN SEARCHES AT SUMTER AND UNION

These searches are now underway. A list of each committee's members is attached.

PRESIDENT AND PROVOST VISITS TO THE CAMPUSES

John Gardner accompanied Provost Moeser on a campus visit to USC Union on January 26. John Duffy accompanied both President Palms and Provost Moeser to USC Lancaster on January 29. Both visits included meetings with students, faculty, staff, and community members.

Both Gardner and Duffy were impressed by the Campuses' presentations.

SYSTEM MISSION STATEMENT

I call to your attention the mission statement (attached) which has been approved by the Board.

REPORT OF THE VICE PROVOST
REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
February 19, 1993

*File
not on
file*

MOVE TO CAROLINA PLAZA

The first of the division offices will begin moving in April. All offices should be in place by June.

CHE FORMULA RECOMMENDATION AND BUDGET STATUS FOR NEXT YEAR

Attached. As you can see the budget picture is not very promising for Columbia or the campuses.

TWO-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY

John R. Arnold of USC Lancaster has been appointed to the CHE's study of two-year higher education. He, George Reeves and Bob Alexander are among the eleven members of the Technical Group of the committee, coordinated by Gail Morrison, Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs for the CHE. In addition, there is a smaller Policy Group, which includes Lily-Roland Hall; William Hubbard is the Chairman of the committee.

"In creating the Committee, the Commission has charged it to examine every aspect of the function of the public two-year institutions with a view toward determining the future of two-year public postsecondary education in the State. The approach of the Commission to this study is one of openness with regard to its substantive outcomes."

The Committee has listed five major goals:

1. Increase access to groups which historically have been denied higher education;
2. Promote excellence which can be demonstrated in learning outcomes;
3. Contribute through their academic programs significantly to the economics progress of the State and the health and cultural developments of its citizenry;
4. Develop a flexible system of delivery which includes distance learning through advanced technology; and
5. Accomplish all objectives within a framework of fiscal responsibility and the elimination of unnecessary duplication at all levels.

THE COLUMBIA CAMPUS

As a major teaching and research institution, the Columbia campus has long offered a full range of undergraduate and graduate programs through the doctoral level. With a comprehensive mission of teaching, research, and service, the Columbia campus addresses the state's needs for master's level, professional, doctoral and doctor of philosophy education, for conducting and sharing research, and for responding to statewide and regional demands for educational resources and professional expertise.

The flagship institution of the system, the Columbia campus aspires to national and international stature as it provides equitable access to the full range of its opportunities, resources, and activities.

SENIOR CAMPUSES

Individually accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Aiken, Coastal, and Spartanburg take as their primary mission the delivery of basic undergraduate education to their respective service areas. These senior campuses also offer graduate-level coursework through the University's Graduate Regional Studies program and sometimes offer master's degree programs in response to regional demand.

REGIONAL CAMPUSES

The regional campuses in Beaufort, Lancaster, Allendale (Salkehatchie), Sumter, and Union principally provide the first two years of undergraduate education, including selected associate degree programs mainly for their respective geographic areas. The regional campuses also provide for the completion of bachelor degrees by offering selected upper-division coursework in conjunction with the Aiken, Coastal, Columbia, and Spartanburg campuses as well as some graduate education through the University's Graduate Regional Studies program. In addition to providing these programs, the regional campuses bring the resources of the entire University system to citizens throughout the state.

REVISED DRAFT

MISSION STATEMENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA SYSTEM

The primary mission of the University of South Carolina, a multi-campus system serving the entire State of South Carolina, is the education of the state's diverse citizens through its endeavors of teaching, research or creative activity, and service.

TEACHING

The University is committed to providing its students with the highest-quality education, including the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for success and responsible citizenship in a complex and changing world. A particular strength of an education at the University of South Carolina is the excellence, breadth, and diversity of the institution's faculty.

RESEARCH

Convinced that research and scholarship, including artistic creation, are essential for excellent teaching, the University aggressively pursues an active research and scholarship program. The University is dedicated to using research to improve the quality of life for South Carolinians.

SERVICE

Another important facet of the University's public mission is service -- to its community, state, nation, and the world in such areas as public health, education, social issues, economic development, and family support systems.

Founded in 1801 in Columbia, the University of South Carolina educated the state's citizens for well over a century before extending its community statewide in the 1950s and 1960s. At that time, a network of campuses was established in response to community initiative and support for accessible, affordable educational programs principally for local citizens. In the 1970's, the Aiken, Conway (Coastal Carolina), and Spartanburg campuses were granted the authority to award baccalaureate degrees. In 1991, the five regional campuses, in Beaufort, Lancaster, Allendale (Salkehatchie), Sumter, and Union - each previously accredited separately - were accredited as parts of the central University institution. While the regional campuses, the senior campuses, and the Columbia campus all pursue teaching, research, creative activity, and service, they do so with an emphasis suited to their individual campus missions.

Sumter Dean's Search Committee

J. T. Myers, Chair
Porter Adams
Art Bahnmuller
Kwame Dawes
Peter Flanagan
John Gardner
Hayne Painter
Chris Plyler
Thomas Powers
Ben Ross
Carolyn West
James White

Union Dean's Search Committee

Mary MacDonald, Chair
Mary Barton
Alan Charles
Carl Clayton
Leslie Kerr
Ann Stevens
Toccoa Switzer
T. D. Truluck
Tandy Willis

1993-94 FORMULA APPROPRIATION CIE STAFF ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATION

INSTITUTION	1993-94	1992-93	1992-93	ALLOCATED		PERCENT CIE STAFF ALLOCATION	PERCENT	COUNCIL	PERCENT	COLUMN 6 MINUS COLUMN 8
	FULL-FORMULA FUNDING		APPROPRIATION	PERCENT FULL FORMULA FUNDING	1993-94 FULL FORMULA FUNDING		PERCENT FULL FORMULA FUNDING	FULL FORMULA FUNDING	OF COLLEGE PRESIDENT ALLOCATION	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
CITADEL	\$17,593,769	\$12,574,924	75.10%	\$11,645,071	66.19%	\$12,127,788	68.93%	\$12,296,054	69.89%	(\$168,266)
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY	125,101,584	78,417,100	67.14%	82,802,996	66.19%	79,516,043	63.56%	79,733,478	63.73%	(217,435)
COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON	32,224,818	20,946,734	68.61%	21,329,158	66.19%	20,932,256	64.96%	21,057,716	65.35%	(125,460)
FRANCIS MARION COLLEGE	16,362,946	11,731,589	73.85%	10,830,406	66.19%	11,463,222	70.06%	11,461,314	70.03%	1,908
LANDER COLLEGE	10,783,640	7,737,522	72.68%	7,137,541	66.19%	7,567,799	70.18%	7,557,580	70.08%	10,219
S.C. STATE COLLEGE	26,996,515	18,554,173	69.88%	17,868,617	66.19%	18,346,566	67.96%	18,348,638	67.97%	(2,072)
U.S.C. - COLUMBIA	169,429,449	117,133,797	72.05%	112,142,993	66.19%	115,853,817	68.38%	115,637,381	68.25%	216,436
U.S.C. - SCHOOL OF MEDICINE	28,101,985	18,491,667	68.62%	18,600,313	66.19%	18,649,955	66.37%	18,524,380	65.92%	125,575
U.S.C. - AIKEN	11,499,422	7,405,229	68.68%	7,611,307	66.19%	7,406,339	64.41%	7,467,109	64.93%	(60,770)
U.S.C. - COASTAL CAROLINA	14,670,175	9,876,034	72.50%	9,709,985	66.19%	9,817,940	66.92%	9,826,291	66.98%	(8,351)
U.S.C. - SPARTANBURG	13,739,191	9,275,830	69.68%	9,093,779	66.19%	9,247,950	67.31%	9,221,282	67.12%	26,668
U.S.C. - BEAUFORT	2,659,719	1,717,884	68.38%	1,760,431	66.19%	1,743,106	65.54%	1,730,661	65.07%	12,445
U.S.C. - LANCASTER	3,434,613	2,341,409	68.89%	2,273,323	66.19%	2,335,918	68.01%	2,321,000	67.58%	14,918
U.S.C. - SALKAHATCHEE	2,808,743	1,753,192	66.32%	1,859,068	66.19%	1,791,590	63.79%	1,784,968	63.55%	6,622
U.S.C. - SUMTER	5,080,605	3,228,923	67.55%	3,362,782	66.19%	3,292,614	64.81%	3,269,105	64.34%	23,509
U.S.C. - UNION	1,275,053	890,763	72.80%	843,940	66.19%	880,898	69.09%	876,722	68.76%	4,176
WINTHROP	23,853,836	18,342,608	75.94%	15,788,522	66.19%	17,553,873	73.59%	17,576,498	73.68%	(22,625)
MEDICAL UNIVERSITY OF S.C.	107,811,581	75,889,204	76.20%	71,358,984	66.19%	74,932,089	69.50%	74,530,663	69.13%	401,426
MEDICAL UNIV. - HOSPITAL	27,260,586	18,132,215	70.58%	18,043,402	66.19%	18,095,345	66.38%	18,105,542	66.42%	(10,197)
AHRC	19,462,880	13,280,626	69.78%	12,882,209	66.19%	12,882,209	66.19%	13,161,196	67.62%	(278,987)
SIFCE	177,640,667	106,801,287	66.51%	117,577,884	66.19%	110,085,392	61.97%	110,035,132	61.94%	50,260
TOTAL	\$837,791,777	\$554,522,710	70.37%	\$554,522,710	66.19%	\$554,522,710	66.19%	\$554,522,710	66.19%	(\$0)

*file of notes
on file*

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST
REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
February 19, 1993

Congratulations

This is to congratulate the present and past members of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate upon the occasion of your 25th Anniversary. It has been an honor and a pleasure for me to have been associated with you over the past decade. I look forward to our continuing partnership.

Columbia Future Committee

The Columbia Division of Regional Campuses and Continuing Education is participating in the Future Committee exercise along with all other units at USC Columbia. Our report was submitted on February 15th. We are providing to each of the Academic Deans on the Regional Campuses a copy of our report for any individuals on your campus who would like to review what we submitted. Of course, we eagerly await the response of the Future Committee. We will do our best to make a high priority our support of continuing education opportunities delivered systemwide from Columbia for our campuses.

Faculty Exchange Program

I am pleased to announce that the Faculty Exchange awards for summer 1993 have been awarded to the following faculty: Professor J. T. Myers, USC Sumter; Professor Susan Moscow, USC Salkehatchie; Professor Charles Cook, USC Sumter; Professor Betty Hodges, USC Lancaster; Professor Bruce Nims, USC Lancaster. These proposals were truly outstanding, and I am thrilled that the University has been able to continue this kind of support even in these times of extreme fiscal austerity.

Regional Campuses Faculty Member to Chair Presidential Advisory Committee

For the first time in my recollection in my ten-year history with Regional Campuses, I am pleased to report that one of our faculty colleagues, Professor Deborah Cureton of USC Lancaster, has been appointed by the President as Chair of the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee. This is a committee whose recommendations can have an enormous impact on the welfare of the students, staff and faculty of the entire University System. This is a real first for the Regional Campuses! Such positions historically have been gone to Columbia personnel.

Faculty Retirement Incentive Plan

As was reported in a recent issue of the USC Times, the Board of Trustees will be asked at its February 19th meeting to approve a faculty retirement incentive plan. This action, of course, will have been taken by the time this report is distributed at our own Regional Campuses Faculty Senate meeting. For complete details on this I refer the faculty to information to be published subsequently in the USC Times.

Spring 1993 Enrollment

please see attached report

Tenure and Promotion Process for Regional Campuses

This is to reiterate my clarion call in previous successive years, that this body take action to reevaluate the current tenure and promotion review process. I continue to maintain that there are a number of serious problems in procedure as opposed to criteria. Particularly troublesome to me are the enormous disparities between the quality of the files and the formats on a campus by campus, individual by individual basis. I am not suggesting that Columbia should be the model, but for years there has at least been some kind of standardized format which faculty have used as a benchmark for submission of their files at Columbia. I believe our colleagues on the Regional Campuses desperately need this kind of common coherent structure. A big concern to me continues to be the untenable position that many of our faculty are put in where they are reviewed for a particular action (promotion or tenure) by persons of equal or junior rank to them. This has an inherent potential for conflict of interest. I believe this weakens the standards for the campuses' highest rank, the professorship. A final area of concern for me is the total lack of individual faculty accountability for having to explain and justify their individual votes in terms of the published criteria. I do not believe this gives adequate protection to the rights of the faculty members under review. As always, I would be glad to talk about this to our faculty. In the final analysis, however, this process belongs to the faculty and any recommended change must come from this body.

Annual Freshman Year Experience Conference, February 20-23

As always, Regional Campuses faculty are invited to the annual Freshman Year Experience Conference. This begins tomorrow, Saturday, at the Columbia Marriott and runs through Tuesday, noon. As has been our past practice, you are welcome to attend on a complimentary fee-waived basis any of the academic content sessions of the conference. For information while you are on campus today, just walk across the street to 1728 College Street, the Freshman Year Experience office and get a registration form and other materials. You are both welcome and encouraged to participate.

****1ST OFFICIAL as of 1/22/93****
 (Includes 0.08% Status 3's)
*****FTE Does NOT include**
 Corresp., II or GRS***

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
 ENROLLMENT COMPARISON
SPRING 1992 vs. SPRING 1993

	HEADCOUNT		F.T.E.**		% CHANGE	
	AS OF 1/24/92	AS OF 1/22/93	Sp/Spl AS OF 1/24/92	Sp/Spl AS OF 1/22/93	HD. CT.	F.T.E.
Columbia U/G	14,494	14,508	13,242	13,016	.1	-1.7
Law	766	720	812	768	-6.0	-5.4
D.Pharm.	48	50	48	52		-13.2
*Masters			2,727	2,367		-2.4
*Doctoral			1,570	1,533		-5.7
*Total Grad.	9,389	8,858				
Sub-Total	24,697	24,136	18,399	17,736	-2.3	-3.6
Aiken	2,920	3,025	2,093	2,176	3.6	4.0
Coastal	3,488	3,558	2,849	2,947	2.0	3.4
Spartanburg	3,331	3,287	2,574	2,553	-1.3	-.8
Beaufort	1,050	1,019	489	484	-3.0	-1.0
Lancaster	963	960	566	548	-.3	-3.2
Salkohatchie	827	820	504	516	-.8	2.4
Sumter	1,468	1,388	872	840	-5.4	-3.7
Union	387	377	220	234	-2.6	6.4
Sub-Total	14,434	14,434	10,167	10,298	.0	1.3
TOTAL	39,131	38,570	28,566	28,034	-1.4	-1.9
Med. School: M.D.	264	268	264	268	1.5	1.5
: Ph.D.	50	53	64	69	6.0	7.8
Total Med. School	314	321	328	337	2.2	2.7

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

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

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

*GRS Excluded above (Previous = Jan.):

Masters:	610	400	-34.4
Doctoral:	231	193	-16.5
TOTAL GRS	841	593	-29.5

SOURCE: E61 Matrix Program.

Prepared by System Office of Institutional Research

cd - 1/26/93

*make sure we
have final file
copy*

RETIREMENT INCENTIVE OPPORTUNITY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA SYSTEM

Introduction

This document sets forth a one-time Retirement Incentive Opportunity for eligible faculty (and staff*) of the University of South Carolina System, pursuant to Section 59-103-150 of the South Carolina Code of Laws. The Retirement Incentive Opportunity will have no impact on state appropriations.

The Retirement Incentive Opportunity is strictly voluntary and is intended to assist the University of South Carolina in meeting the following objectives:

- (1) To reallocate institutional resources; and
- (2) To provide an equitable method to increase the flexibility of the University of South Carolina to effect cost-saving measures.

Retirement Incentive

For eligible faculty (and staff*) who make a voluntary but irrevocable commitment to retire under the terms of this agreement, the University of South Carolina will provide a lump sum payment of one-half of the faculty (or staff*) member's budgeted base salary at the time of retirement.

The lump sum payment will be made on the scheduled pay date which covers the retiring individual's last day on the payroll. Pursuant to Section 9-1-1020 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, this incentive payment will not be included in the average final compensation for purposes of calculating the amount of the retirement annuity with the South Carolina Retirement System.

Eligibility

Permanent faculty (and staff*) who have been employed in a state-slotted position with the University of South Carolina for at least five years by the date of retirement, and who meet one or more of the following criteria are eligible for the Retirement Incentive Opportunity:

1. Have established or will have established 30 years of service credit with the South Carolina Retirement Systems, the Optional Retirement Program or a 403(b) tax deferred annuity plan by the date of retirement; or

2. Have attained or will have attained the age of 60 by the date of retirement;
or
3. Have attained or will have attained the age of 55 and have 25 years of established service with the South Carolina Retirement Systems, the Optional Retirement Program, or a 403(b) tax deferred annuity plan by the date of retirement.

Window of Opportunity

Eligible faculty (and staff*) must make a voluntary but irrevocable election no earlier than March 1, 1993 and no later than July 31, 1993 to retire from their permanent positions according to the terms of this document. The Retirement Incentive Opportunity is intended to be a one-time opportunity which may or may not be offered in future years.

Retirement Incentive Opportunity Agreement

Faculty (and staff*) who wish to apply for the Retirement Incentive Opportunity must make a voluntary election on the Retirement Incentive Opportunity Agreement. The agreement must be submitted to the University's Division of Human Resources between the dates of March 1, 1993 and July 31, 1993. The applicant's eligibility must be verified subject to the terms of this document before the agreement can be approved.

Once the agreement has been approved it shall become irrevocable unless the University President and the faculty (or staff*) member mutually agree to the revocation.

Effective Date of Retirement Under the Retirement Incentive Opportunity

All eligible persons who wish to participate in the Retirement Incentive Opportunity must make a voluntary but irrevocable election to retire from permanent employment with the University pursuant to the terms of this program. The effective date of retirement must be stipulated in the Retirement Incentive Opportunity agreement and must be no earlier than May 15, 1993 and no later than June 30, 1994.

General Information

Faculty (and staff*) are encouraged to consult the advice of a financial advisor concerning the tax and other consequences before entering into the Retirement Incentive Opportunity agreement.

Pursuant to Section 9-1-1020 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, payments for single, special payments at the time of retirement are not compensation from which retirement contributions are deductible. Accordingly, the lump sum payment offered in this program will not count toward the average final compensation in computing the amount of

the faculty (or staff*) member's retirement annuity; however, the lump sum payment will be treated as ordinary income subject to applicable withholdings.

The lump-sum payment will not be counted as earnings for purposes of the post-retirement earnings allowance for either the South Carolina Retirement System or the Social Security Administration, and therefore will not reduce the amount of post-retirement earnings an individual may receive.

The window of opportunity does not affect eligibility requirements for the State Retirees' Health and Dental Plans. Persons retiring pursuant to the Retirement Incentive Opportunity are encouraged to consult the University of South Carolina Benefits Office concerning the effect to employee benefits.

***NOTE:** Section 59-103-150 of the South Carolina Code of Laws does not currently include staff participation in an early retirement plan. It is the intention of the University to seek an amendment to the law which will enable staff to participate.