

The University of South Carolina Regional Campuses Faculty Senate Minutes
USC Columbia
Daniel Management Center
September 8, 1995

Morning Session Room 853

The meeting was called to order by Wayne Chilcote, Chair. The Chair welcomed new Senate members and University officers from the USC System to the initial meeting: of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate. A special welcome was extended to Drs. Don Griner,- Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Marcia Welsh, immediate Past Chair of the Columbia Faculty Senate. The Chair introduced President John Palms and Provost James Moeser both of whom were the morning speakers. " (" A' transcription of Dr. Palms' remarks are attached to this document as Appendix I, and a transcription of Provost Moeser's remarks are attached as Appendix II.)

IA. President John Palms

President Palms gave the Senate an update on the meetings being held throughout the state on the National Resource Program, the foundation for the 2001 Campaign. The presentation which has been given in these meetings is a report of where the University System is today and a vision of where we want to be. Dr. Palms reported that during these meetings a number of South Carolina Legislators have been included as community leaders. The legislators have expressed positive feelings concerning the budget process for higher education. Dr. Palms has also met with three members of the Commission of Higher Education's Legislative Study Committee. He is pleased with what these members are saying should be the purpose of the higher education study. The members who have spoken to President Palms have said that body will ask fundamental questions concerning the kinds of institutions and corresponding missions as well as the location which are appropriate for South Carolina. The University administration will continue to monitor this situation closely. President Palms then answered questions from the floor.

IB. Provost James Moeser

Provost Moeser informed the Senate that a new planning cycle would be instituted this year which involved the Regional Campuses. Unlike the University Future Committee, this will not be a reallocation process. The goal of this new initiative will be planning and addressing critical issues such as communication and information technology. This will be a process based on our vision and will form the foundation which will propel us into the future. The Provost addressed issues such as increasing admissions standards, the role of the Regional Campuses within the USC System, and The Provisional Year as a model for the Regional Campuses. It is his belief that the Regional Campuses should admit students who are qualified and prepared for academic work which is slightly less rigorous and the students are held to a slightly less rigorous standard than is

the case on the Columbia campus. At the Regional Campuses, there are additional resources such as individual attention which provide those students with the tools to succeed. Utilizing one of the delivery mechanisms at the Regional Campuses, those students subsequently earn a baccalaureate degree.

In this presentation Provost Moeser posed a potential question which he feels should be addressed by the Legislative Study Committee. This question concerns the role of the Regional Campuses on remedial work. He subsequently provided his philosophy on this issue by stating that he believes that our campuses should not be directing resources toward providing students with academic courses which are high school level. In addition, he reiterated his position that all new tenure-track appointments to the University carry the terminal degree or its equivalent. In his discussion of this position he conceded that there would, however, be some good and justifiable exceptions to this rule. He emphasized that it was this position on faculty credentials and expectations which distinguished the Regional Campuses from the state technical-vocational institutions. He also complimented the Regional Campuses faculty on our effort to require thorough documentation and evidence of effective teaching in recent tenure and promotion processes. He recognized the role of service on our campuses and acknowledged its place in the requirements for tenure and promotion. However, he reemphasized the continued role that scholarship, creativity, and pedagogical research play in this process on our campuses.

During the time for questions from the floor, John Catalano asked Provost Moeser to address reinstating the System Academic Advisory Committee. Provost Moeser listened to concerns from numerous senators about what academic issues needed to be discussed. The senators presented a strong argument that no other vehicle existed to discuss problems which inhibited the System's effectiveness. He conceded that there did need to be a way to deal with these vital academic concerns and promised to tackle this problem by constituting some derivative of the old committee of the regional campuses and Columbia. The provost was asked if salaries should be addressed in this examination of the tenure and promotion process. He answered that the two were inexorably linked because, in his view, salaries should be linked to performance and merit. However, he pointed out that linking salary to performance meant that salary awards had to be tied to the evaluation of performance. He was asked to address the post-tenure review process. He restated his strong belief in the tenure system. However, he also gave his view that as a faculty we must have high expectations and standards for faculty whom we tenure and those expectations remain after tenure is awarded. Provost Moeser emphasized that the best defense for the tenure process is the inherent rigor of the process.

II Announcements

Following several logistical announcements concerning committee meetings, the Chair apologized for the unfortunate misunderstanding that Professor Kwame Dawes was resigning to take a position on the Columbia Campus and would not serve as the Chair of the RCFS Welfare Committee. This miscommunication resulted in Professor Dawes not receiving the Executive Committee Retreat information.

Afternoon Session

The Chair began by formally thanking Kathy Gue, Office Manager for Continuing Education Academic Programs, who arranged our luncheon. Professor Chilcote then introduced Professor Henry Price, Chair of the Columbia Faculty Senate. Professor Price pledged his efforts to facilitate communication between the Columbia Senate and the Regional Campuses Senate. He encouraged senators to communicate concerns and information to him via E-mail. He promised to do whatever he could to help with such issues.

I. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

The minutes of the April issue were approved as written.

II. Reports of University Officers.

A. Report of Vice Provost John Duffy.

Dr. Duffy reported that the budget process is over and that the University actually fared quite well in that we only experienced a \$1 million cut when the threat was for a 5% budget cut. This money, as always, is soft money and is subject to cuts later in the year if the situation changes. The faculty should know that the state did approve an average raise of 3.5%. The situation for next year's budget remains cloudy. The state has over \$300 million in the surplus account. The Council of Presidents has proposed that some of that surplus be allocated to higher education. Enrollment is up at Beaufort and Salkehatchie, down at Sumter, and about the same at Union and Lancaster. Dr. Duffy reported that he has requested the appropriate administrative staff investigate what it will take to have a network and Internet connections for the Regional Campuses. There are already established requests which may provide for the funding for this link.

Dr. Duffy is arranging for workshops to provide information on sexual harassment for all faculty on the Regional Campuses. Dr. Duffy also noted that an hoc committee appointed by the Chair of the Senate had met with the Provost and raised many of the questions concerning the tenure and promotion process which the Provost addressed this morning. This committee's ideas provided useful information on this issue.

Professor Robert Castleberry asked Dr. Duffy to discuss who is on the Legislative Study Committee. Dr. Duffy reported that the committee consists of five State Senators, five Representatives, and five businessmen. At the first meeting, the committee had arranged to have representatives from the Southern Regional Education Board and an economist for USC Columbia discuss the role of higher education in South Carolina. These speakers emphasized that our state is under educated and higher education is under funded by both national and regional standards. The point was also made that to increase economic growth and development higher education is an essential component. During this discussion, David Hunter warned that as a follow-up to the Two Year Study, CHE had asked for information which will be critical of what we are doing. However, this information is biased by the way it was asked and is not a part of the Legislative Study Committee.

B. Report of Associate Vice Provost John Gardner. (See Appendix III).

III Report of the Deans.

Beaufort: Dean Chris Plyler reported that Beaufort has experienced an increase in enrollment especially in FTE. There have been some personnel changes. A search is underway for a new Director at the Hilton Head Campus and a Director of Graduate Regional Studies and Continuing Education. Dr. Marge Yanker, who was the Director of GRS and Continuing Education, who developed and implemented the Creative Retirement Center in Beaufort, has taken a position as the Director of the new division of Organizational Services of the American Management Association. USCB has two new faculty members, marine scientist Dr. David Osgood from the University of Virginia and sociologist Dr. Lynn Mulkey from Hofstra University. We continue to work on the plans for the renovation of the old Beaufort College building, and we have begun working on the master planning process for the Okatie parcel. During the next week, Dr. Palms will be on Hilton Head for the NPR presentation. In addition, Commissioner Sheheen will visit for the Hilton Head College Center debate. We will keep you informed.

Continuing Education:

Dean John May reported that the new official name for Lifelong Learning is Continuing Education. The enrollment is not official at this point; however, Sally Boyd feels the it will be about the same as last year.

Lancaster: (See Appendix IV).

Salkehatchie:

Dean Carl Clayton reported that there are personnel changes on his campus. Edward Merwin is a new faculty member serving as the librarian at the Walterboro campus. Dr. Susan Moscow is the new Director of Graduate Regional Studies. Dr. Palms has visited us already concerning the capital campaign, and Dr. Don Griner was an interesting engaging speaker at our initial convocation.

Dean Clayton expressed his community's concern over another study of higher education in South Carolina. The prevailing opinion of the legislative delegation is that the Legislature would like to make a symbolic change. The citizenry in his community feels that Salkehatchie is a prime candidate to be symbolic. He offered to be a part of any cooperative effort to keep this issue of the floor of the legislature.

Finally, Dean Clayton reported that USCSalkehatchie is exploring a cooperative effort with the State Technical System. As a part of how he perceives cooperation, Dean Clayton favors Salkehatchie gaining approval from the State Technical Board to offer technical courses as an institution. He has appointed a committee to study this possibility and it is his objective that if the committee recommends favorably then their final target is for USCS to have a concrete plan by the fall of 1995. Enrollment at Salkehatchie has increased by some 5%.

Many questions were posed from the floor concerning this issue. Sally Boyd ask if Salkehatchie was exploring offering these courses through Technical College of the Lowcountry or Orangeburg Technical College. The response from Dean Clayton was that they would offer them through the USC Board of Trustees. He was asked if the date he meant was for 1996. His answer was that he wanted a needs assessment completed, a plan submitted and approved by the Board of Trustees. John Catalano asked if the courses would be offered as a part of a program? Dean Clayton responded that Dr. Mack Holderfield had explained that approval could be sought for independent courses, certificates or diploma programs. John Catalano asked Dean Clayton his intention for seeking Senate approval of these courses or programs. The Dean's answer was that he had not intended to seek such approval. Dean Clayton said that he saw the line of approval as being from the Board of Trustees' Academic Affairs Committee to the full Board of Trustees.

During this discussion, John Catalano asked Dr. Duffy if his office supports the concept of our campuses offering technical courses and his position on who should teach these courses. Dr. Duffy's response was that in the case of Salkehatchie he supports their offering courses. However, his position is that the technical faculty should teach the courses. Professor Catalano asked for assurance from Dr. Duffy that before any program in which USC Salkehatchie teaches technical courses such is offered that the campus seek approval from the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate. Dr. Duffy assured Professor Catalan that any such program would come before the Senate. Dr. Duffy also reminded the Senate that this proposal is simply in the discussion phase. Dean Clayton added that at this juncture the study committee is analyzing the need for any programs. The decision will depend on the results of their study.

Sumter:

Dean Carpenter reported that plans for the renovation of the student union have been redone so that the total project will be within budget. The "Commitment 4 Tomorrow," with the 4 meaning programs rather than status, will be complete by the end of this year. This effort has raised \$475,000 of its goal of \$500,000. For the third year, enrollments are down at Sumter. The decrease is between 7-9% this year. Sumter is investigating reaffiliating the education degree program with USC Spartanburg. Dean Carpenter announced that Professor Kwame Dawes will be leaving at the end of fall semester to take a position at USC Columbia. He will be greatly missed; however, this is a good opportunity for Professor Dawes' academic career.

Union:

Dean Jim Edwards announced the appointment of Jean Denman as Director of Continuing Education at Union. She has developed and implemented efforts to provide continuing education opportunities with business and industry. It is has much promise for success for USC Union. The campus is participating in several collaborative ventures such as the downtown renovation in which the city has given money to support landscaping on the Union campus. Another joint effort with the city will provide scholarship work opportunities for college students to earn tuition vouchers. In addition, a juvenile evaluation center is being built which will bring 200 new jobs to the area many of which will be professional positions.

Dean Edwards reported that USC Union is also a participant in the discussions with the State Technical Administration. In addition, Union is a part of the committee assessing needs for technical courses and programs such as has been described by Dean Clayton in its geographical area. Union will host the Board of Trustees meeting on October 14, the same day which the campus will have a fund-raising reception. In addition, the campus will celebrate its 30 year anniversary.

IV Reports of Standing Committees.

A. Rights and Responsibilities.

In attendance were: Danny Faulkner, Bruce Nims, Steve Anderson, Rose Maitland, Joanne Klein, David Bowden, Jeff Strong, Larry West, Sheila Tombe. The committee discussed its charges for this year. The charges are: (1) to revise section C-2 of the Faculty Manual with regard to research and scholarship in considering tenure and promotion and (2) to consider revision of faculty rank descriptions to include a requirement of a terminal degree. Both of these are in response to recent actions or statements by the Provost.

John Catalano briefed us on a meeting that he and two other members of an ad hoc committee (Carolyn West and Tandy Willis) recently had with the Provost. Some of the statements in the Provost's report this morning were a result of this meeting. In addition, we plan to use Ernest Boyer's book, Scholarship Reconsidered in our deliberation.

B. System Affairs.

The committee agreed to postpone the proposal from Sumter for 4 new RCAM Bio-Business courses to give committee members an opportunity to study it further and circulate this information with other senators and campus colleagues. In addition the committee discussed charges given to the committee and agreed that they too needed further study; therefore, we have postponed consideration of them until the Nov. meeting.

The committee submitted the following motion:

(1) To acknowledge and appreciate the thoughtful consideration of Provost Moeser in reviewing the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness. (2) To reestablish the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness, the members to be appointed by the Chair of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate. (3) To charge the committee with continuing its work, as outlined in its report of April 1995. The motion carried.

C. Welfare.

The committee discussed the charges for the coming year and planned how it would study and respond to each charge. The complete committee report is included as Appendix V.

VI. Report of the Executive Committee.

The secretary reported the minutes from the Executive Committee Planning Retreat. These minutes are included as Appendix VI.

Professor Sal Macias clarified the admission standards on the Sumter campus. Sumter publishes the same admission standard as Columbia; however, in practice, the admissions office has been instructed to admit any student who has a 2.0 GPA automatically. Professor Carolyn West added that the /Sumter campus designates any student with a GPA greater than or equal to 2.0 and less than 2.45 as a 'Branch' student. This is the case on all Regional Campuses.

VII. Reports of Special Committees.

A. University Library Committee.

Professor Bruce Nims read the report of the committee which is included in Appendix VII.

B. University Committee on Courses and Curricula.

Professor Bob Costello read the report for Professor Robert Castleberry. This report is included as Appendix VIII.

C. University Committee on Faculty Welfare.

Professor Roy Darby reported that the committee has not met.

D. Faculty Board of Trustees Liaison Committee.

Professor Carolyn West reported that the committee met on June 26; however, because of a misunderstanding about the fact that Professor West was our representative, she did not know about this meeting. Professor West will attend the first meeting on October 11.

E. Research and Scholarly Productivity.

Professor Tye Johnson reported that Dr. Moeser has totally redesigned the process of research and productive scholarship grants, with the emphasis on research and the definition of what research comprises. The new structure breaks down grants into two categories. One is a \$10,000 grant that requires that the research proposal have an almost certainty of attracting outside funding, of other outside funding besides the funding they give you. Then the second one, category two, is a \$7,500 grant which is essentially the same requirements as the process required in the past.

A report goes out to a variety of campuses. The Faculty Grant Application Kit which delineates the requirements for producing a grant to be considered. Professor Johnson encouraged anybody with a question to call. Professor Johnson has experience in this process and can help guide a faculty member through writing a proposal that would get due consideration.

F. Savannah River Site Committee.

Professor Dan Ruff reported that the committee has not met this term.

G. Insurance and Annuities.

Professor Jerry Dockery reported that this committee has not met.

H. Other Committees.

1. Outside Activities

Professor Jerry Dockery reported for Professor Tandy Willis. The policy that was recently established on outside professional activities has been approved. It was approved by Marsha Torr, Associate Provost for Research. That approval date was August 1, 1995. The Vice Provost's office does have a copy of that approval.

I. Ad Hoc Committee.

Professor John Catalano reminded the Senate that this committees work has already been reported by the Provost.

III. Unfinished Business.

A discussion on the status of the Grievance Procedure should be determined. Dr. Duffy will check on the status of this issue.

IV. New Business.

Professor Jane Upshaw reported on the recent retreat supported by the Dr. Marsha Torr in charge of the Office of Research. The focus of this meeting was interdisciplinary grants. It opened a lot of dialogue between regional campus people and some pretty important research people on this campus.

If you know of any interdisciplinary studies that you would like to participate in, you need to let the Office of Research know. That office is interested in increasing our funding through grants significantly and this provides an opportunity for us.

The thrust of these retreats were for outside funding. A definition of what interdisciplinary research might be, how we might put together an interdisciplinary team. It was to give the Provost ideas of what she could do to help us with that. This experience was a good opportunity for our campuses, and I'd like for Dr. Torr to be recognized by this body for her efforts.

A motion was made to accept the recommendation of the Executive Committee to change the April meeting to April 12 on Hilton Head. The motion was seconded and subsequently passed.

The meeting was adjourned.

**President John Palms' Remarks
September 8, 1995**

Good morning. I hope you are as excited as we have been all around the state. I have been traveling for the last three or four weeks visiting campuses, presenting the vision of the University of South Carolina on all of its campuses. I want to tell you how well this presentation is being received. For those of you who are not familiar with this, this is called the National Resource Program. It is the foundation for the campaign for 2001.

In this project, we meet with a couple dozen of principal leaders in the community. I speak for about a half hour laying out where the University is today, what our ambitions are for the future, what our goals are for particular programs, and relate very clearly to them that this is a consensus vision of this University that has been arrived at over the last three or four years in discussions with all of our constituencies, our faculty, our student body, our administrators, our Board of Trustees. Then, they are asked, they have a computer printout with over 1,000 names with friends of the University, alumni of the University, and they are asked to grade them on the basis of A, B, C and D, the potential for support for the University in a major campaign. In just Lexington County, we uncovered 1,000 new names that we did not have and about \$30 million of potential gifts.

This program's purpose is to try to assess what would be a reasonable campaign goal. In the vision statement is included our vision for all of the campuses as well. This is a collective campaign for all of the places where we teach in this state.

After that presentation, I meet with a number of leaders in the community, and then we have a luncheon and usually have a couple of dozen people there. We've had a number of legislators, we've had a number of senators in these communities meeting with us. I've heard nothing but positive things about the University. I've heard no one say we ought to cut budgets for higher education. I have heard a lot of people say, "I think we made a mistake last year in the legislature. We don't want to be branded as the anti-higher education legislature in South Carolina." So I am hearing good rhetoric and that's very important.

One of the visions that I explained, it is our intention to continually improve the quality of the student body of the University of South Carolina on all the campuses. You know what has happened on this campus. The faculty, for two years in a row, has increased the admissions standards and that has resulted in an increased applicant pool and, for the first time in modern times, we have a freshman class here on the Columbia Campus with an SAT over 1000, 1004. That's what we want to do - raise that quality.

Those of you who were at the Senate meeting, at the General Faculty meeting the other day and listened to the deans introduce their new faculty, the same surge we're making in improving the student, we're focusing on improving the quality of faculty. We are just really recruiting the very, very best faculty coming out of the best graduate schools in the country.

Yesterday, U.S. News & World Report rated Columbia's undergraduate international business program number one in the nation. We already had the MIBS program ranked number one. Now we have the undergraduate international business ranked number one. And, for the first time, the undergraduate business school has been ranked 48th in the country. As you know, we want to become members of the American Association of Universities, and that means we

want to be in the top 58 or 60 of both private and public major universities in the country. Those rankings are very, very important to us.

We've got a strong enrollment. I understand at the most of the campuses, your enrollment is strong. In some places it is down a little bit, but one of our strengths is the number of students that we teach. We want to be sure that we maintain that enrollment. I've asked the faculty on this campus to pay special attention to our undergraduates. Again, I know of no great university that doesn't have a great undergraduate enrollment, good students who are cared for and who feel they are important to the faculty. I have offered, at least on this campus, that any faculty member who has lunch or breakfast with a student between the 15th of September and the 15th of October, I will pay for that. That's from this campus' budget. I don't know how I'd do that for the rest of the campuses. I'm assuming the chancellors would be able to do something similar to that on the other campuses. I'd have to talk to Johnny about how we could do that. You don't have that many places to dine. I don't want you to go to the most fancy restaurants in all these communities.

But I've been to Anderson, Spartanburg, Greenville, Greenwood, Rock Hill, Lancaster, Sumter, Allendale and Walterboro so far. Yesterday, I was in St. Matthews and Orangeburg. There's a wonderful feeling about the University right now. We're on a roll and I think we need to use that in the power structure of what is happening in the state with the Legislative Study Committee.

I have met with three of those members independently. I am encouraged by the approach they are taking to the task they have. They have decided to be very statesman-like and to first focus on what the questions are we should be asking ourselves. They had a representative from the Southern Regional Educational Board in to give them some objective data on how the state is supporting higher education and where we are.

That was very enlightening to them because we are behind in faculty salaries, we are behind in need-based scholarships, we are behind in allocations per student, and they've heard that. I believe what they are going to be asking is questions such as "what kinds of institutions do we need, what should their mission be, where should be they located?" Very fundamental questions that I know they've asked 20 times in the last 20 years. But they are trying to go about this in a way that is very, very objective. We will watch it very carefully and stay in close communication with members of that committee.

We have been steadfastly trying to provide good information to the Governor's Office. You know our Chairman of the Board went with the Governor for a week of recreation to Ireland. He had some opportunity there to whisper in his ear now and then. I've been invited to go with him to an economic development trip to Korea. I'm going to do that at the end of September. The Secretary of Commerce, Bob Royal, has been closely in touch with the University as he is working on economic development in the state, and has also very, very strongly affirmed the role that the University is playing with that focus from the Governor's Office.

So I think we are off to a good start. If we win a football game tomorrow, we'll be in a little better position. As I have said over and over again, we want to belong to that group of institutions called the American Association of Universities. We know what the parameters are that give us membership to that. We're working very hard. I've told them that the best thing we can do for the state is have this Columbia campus be in that league of play. That would help all of our campuses raise ourselves.

We do want to be distinctive as a group of campuses. We do have an obligation to raise the standards on all of our campuses. I want to encourage you to do that, both with the student body that you recruit and also with the faculty that you have, as far as faculty recruiting and faculty development. I am sure the Provost will speak more about that. It's very, very important.

I presented, made a presentation to the Commission on Higher Education a couple of weeks ago. This was an invitation we have every year to present our budget to the Commission. I did not present a lot of numbers, I did not present a lot of graphs. There were presidents there who had big books of statistical analysis they went through. But I spoke, again, about the same vision statement for this institution - the history of this institution, the charge that we had to educate as many people in South Carolina as possible, and we adhered to that charge. I talked about the motto of this University.

I told them that I would be happy to have just a steady cost-of-living increase in the formula, that we would keep tuition just a little bit below the cost of living, if we could be assured of that kind of funding to get away from this roller coaster effect every year, that we are about to make some major investments in the institution. We needed to have that assurance of some sort of steady budgeting process. I believe that's realistic based on the political focus that is now in this state, the ambitions of trying to reduce property taxes, at the same time, understanding that we are under-funded in higher education, that we would raise the rest of the money if we could do that. We need some capital money to go along with that. I'm talking about the formula funding and tuition increases. There are a number of states who have made those contracts with the legislatures. At least they have some steady funding expectations that we really need at this time. It's very, very important for us to do that. We'll see what happens with that recommendation.

I would be glad to answer any questions you have of me, hear any comments you may have about the University.

Professor Sal Macias, Sumter: Dr. Palms, could you tell me how the University is addressing the House Bill to abolish tenure in this state?

President Palms: Well, you heard it last year. We are very strongly opposed to that. We would be singled out as probably the only state in the United States that would do that. It would be very detrimental. Nobody that I know of in a responsible position in the legislature was supportive of that. There were about 40 people who signed that initial proposition, but it didn't go anywhere. We have had to respond. We've had to respond to requests on a couple of issues. One is tenure, one is sabbatical leaves that they are concerned about. But our position is very strong. There is no great university in this country that doesn't have tenure, that doesn't have sabbatical leaves. We call sabbaticals for them "continuing training," just like industry has to do. We have to continue to train our people.

Professor Macias: The Board of Trustees of Frances Marion has made a move to challenge tenure there. The local legislators from Florence are supporting the Bill. It's going to be back on the floor this year.

Professor Jerry Dockery, Continuing Education: That's correct. I'm Chairman of the AAUP Committee charged with monitoring this issue, and I am scheduled to go there in two weeks.

President Palms: You'll just have to stick together on it. I don't think it would be in the best interest of any institution in the state. I think we all realize that there are a number of institutions in the country where a percentage of faculty are no longer on tenure track. We have adjuncts teaching here. We have lecturers teaching. 17% of our undergraduates are taught by non-faculty. That's a trend. But I don't think that the abolishment of tenure is a serious threat for this University. It depends on how we behave, too. I've initiated tenure revocation procedures for a faculty member on this campus. It is a very serious matter. This faculty member has absolutely due process. There are people outside the University who felt like we should have just taken tenure away immediately. They don't understand this process. This happens to be in the profession of law, but the Carolina Bar didn't disbar him. But he was not allowed to practice for two years. It is not so simple for the Carolina Bar to do this, either.

But we are serious about exploring this year post-tenure review. The Provost will talk about that a little bit. I think people require that we have annual review of everyone, whether they are tenured or not. We have to be accountable, we have to document that we are reviewing people, and if the people are not performing according to their responsibilities, that we have a way of revoking tenure. I think we have to show that. Increasingly, the best institutions in the country are moving toward post-tenure review processes.

I know the feeling in the country is that there is hardly a profession today where you are secure. You used to be able to work for a utility company and know you had a lifelong job. That's no longer the case. You used to be able to go to work for a bank and have a lifetime job. That's no longer the case. Major corporations are doing away with longevity. Everyone is being graded on a yearly merit performance basis.

We are the last profession that seems to have protection. There is a certain amount of resentment of this within the communities. It plays well with the politicians in their speeches. Why should we be protected? Nobody else is.

I think we just have to show a very deep sense of commitment to our professions and show that responsibility and accountability, and I think we will be alright. But if we get horror stories talked about us in the community, if we go home and spend the afternoon working on the lawn and the next door neighbors see you there and don't think you're working, there are little things like that which make an awful big difference in today's political climate.

Marcia Welsh, Columbia: I attended every one of the meetings they had at the State House last year and in '92. I think there were a couple people on that committee who were adamantly in favor of doing away with tenure and tried to push their own agenda. But it didn't work. They pretty much failed to convince anyone that doing away with tenure was the issue. I felt pretty much that the issue was dead. But I do agree. We are going to have to do better in monitoring our own. I think the post-tenure review issue is going to be critical for us this next year, and advertising that we are willing to do it.

President Palms: Besides, in this state, you probably have more security being a state employee than you have in tenure. You can always say, "O.K., just make us state employees. We'll have more protection." I jest, of course. Anybody else, any comments?

Professor Robert Castlebury, Sumter: The legislature is again looking at the regional campuses, specifically Beaufort and Sumter. What is your involvement in that process and what is your reading of the make-up of that committee?

President Palms: I don't believe that this committee initially has focused on Sumter and Beaufort, or the medical schools or duplication. They are looking at what is best for the whole state right now. We have been working, the Provost and I and John, have been meeting with the chairmen of the technical schools. Referring back to the two-year study committee, that is the report we are using. We sent in the progress we have made thus far. We are working more closely with articulation agreements. At Aiken, there is more cooperation among programs, like some industrial mathematics things. We are just going ahead like we agreed to on the two-year study. We are holding fast to that.

Certainly, in visiting these communities, I see there is no indication that they may want to change what we are doing, what we agreed to do, under the two-year study report. But we are just being vigilant, and I am sure we understand any issues that are being brought up. There is a perception out there and there is reality out there. The more you talk about these things and relate to reality, the better understanding there is. I haven't heard anybody suggest an alternative to what we have that is acceptable to anyone.

But it will be an anxious year. I'm not saying it's not something we don't have to worry about. But right now, there is some mythical perception about duplication. We go back to the fact that we have 13% college graduates in this state, and the average in America is 21%. If a percentage of high school graduates went to college, we wouldn't have enough colleges. The classrooms are full. People are passing courses and they need this kind of training. We have the best mixture. We have absolutely a different mission, a different culture in the technical schools than we have in our two-year institutions.

If you're interested in baccalaureate degree success and you start out on one of our campuses, we have the numbers we've thrown back as far as the associate degrees. They have not been very popular programs, they have not been productive programs. They have not produced the students that have moved on to baccalaureate degrees. We just throw out those numbers.

In spite of the increased tuition on the regional campuses, enrollments are still strong. We are offering a product that is viable. I need your help in that. You just keep telling me about the success stories of your programs and I can relate those on to the people who raise concerns.

Billie Bone's changing parties and doing this on the Lancaster Campus with the Governor there, and saying, "This campus is important to the state, and this concept of education is important, this kind of a campus is important," was a significant endorsement. I read that to be also the Governor's support of the concept of the University. Anybody else?

Ellen Chamberlain, Beaufort: I want to thank you for giving all of the students at the University of South Carolina computer accounts.

President Palms: 35,000 computer accounts!

Professor Chamberlain: Yes. A number of students at our campus. I know not all the regional campuses are the same, but a number at our campus are taking advantage of that and they are looking around for opportunities and options to use their accounts. Many of them come in taking

courses from professors in Columbia who tell them to come in and use Netscape, and we can't use Netscape on our campus. None of us can. We have no local area network and we have only shell accounts on the CMS mainframe. What it would cost to network our campus, and probably a couple of others, is way beyond the capacity of our operating budget to be able to take care of it, to accommodate it. Therefore, it's one of those wants that keeps being pushed back year after year. My question is, a tremendous amount of money was made available on the Columbia campus to network all of Columbia. Is there a possibility that funds would be made available to help the regional campuses provide the same kind of access for our students as they would get if they were students in Columbia?

President Palms: I'll tell you what I've been telling these groups. I do brag about the fact that we've laid almost 15 miles of fiber optic cable on this campus. Last year at this time, we had 82 buildings connected. Now we have 115. We have 5,600 workstations. They are presenting to me, the computer people, a long-term strategic acquisition plan for a major new mainframe which will implement a client-server concept.

I've been saying we're going to make these resources available to all of our campuses. We're going to find a way to network all of the campuses. One of the strengths of keeping this system together is that we have this resource and we can link ourselves and take advantage of that. We've got to find a way to do that. So we've got to finish what we're doing here and get a bigger processing capacity here to do it. But that is certainly the intention.

The money on this campus came from the fact that they shifted money from other important areas into this. We are hurting in some of the other areas. But either through the campaign that we'll have or just juggling some money, we're going to have to do this if we're going to justify why we're important as an entity. All of our campuses stay together. Maybe James will add to that a little bit. But we've been meeting all summer trying to work this out.

I've never seen so many computers coming out of the trunks and hands of freshmen moving into the dorms this year. These are not cheap computers. These are \$5,000-10,000 computers. They used to have big speakers, now you've got small speakers and big computers. They're going to demand it.

Professor Chamberlain: They will, because many of them have those options in high schools and they expect to find the same thing, and even better, when they go to college.

President Palms: No question about it. Thank you very much.

Provost James Moeser's Remarks
September 8, 1995

As the President mentioned, the process that we underwent on the Columbia campus three years ago was the University Future Committee, which did not directly impact the regional campuses. It was an internal process of reallocation of the Columbia budget. We are now in the third and final year of that planning cycle. In the coming year, we will be entering a new planning cycle which will involve the regional campuses. So, overall, the University's strategic planning process will start really with the President's vision for the University. Inasmuch as the five regional campuses are incorporated into Columbia, into our accreditation as a single institution, we want you to be part of that process. It will not be a reallocation process, but it will be a planning process.

I think, Ellen, we will try to begin to address some of these very critical issues. Information technology and communication, which you very correctly address, are, I think, major and critical concerns if we are to be the kind of university that we claim to be and that we aim to be.

As you, one of my concerns is that planning in this University has been, in my opinion, a pretty disjunctive process up until now, especially with regard to the larger university. The regional campuses have, in a sense, planned in a vacuum, without any relationship to Columbia, and with very little relationship with each other. I see, from time to time, plans for four-year degree programs floating up and down which, in my view, are not realistic in this state. But I think we have to address our ability to deliver degree programs on the several campuses.

So what I want this to be is a planning process that is realistic and visionary at the same time. I think we will be talking a lot more about this with the deans and with Dr. Duffy, and then the deans, I hope, will be talking with faculty, because we want this to be a process that really happens at the local site, within the colleges, and on the campuses, and ultimately comes together to form a plan for this university that can help propel us forward.

I don't think there is any magic answer, Ellen, to your question. I think it will take, ultimately, a fairly significant state appropriation to really put the information technology in place. One of the things that actually the Council of Presidents and the Commission are both endorsing is a major allocation from the surplus bill that would address information technology. It's a \$5 million idea which this university could stand to benefit from in a significant way. Whether or not that happens, of course, is a major issue.

To answer your question, why did we do this in Columbia, but didn't do it elsewhere, the simple answer is, as the President indicated, the funds for our reallocation came internally. We actually took money from non-academic areas and put them into academic areas in order to make these things happen. It was a very painful process on this campus and there were screams of anguish when we did it. But, as a result, we have been able to do some positive things.

I invite you now, in your free time between sessions, to go over and look at the classrooms we've upfitted. We now have a permanent fund of \$700,000. This is all reallocated money that we, literally, extracted from other sectors of the University to put into a classroom renovation fund, to create classrooms of the future.

We need to do this on a university-wide basis. I don't know any easy way to get there the way we are currently budgeted, with separate budget lines going to each of the campuses. I don't suggest any change in that, and it may take some, I think, real vision and good luck for us to make progress on this. But I think we should create the design for what we know needs to happen.

You all, I heard in some of your questions - I know what some of your concerns are, and I'm going to try to address those; then I'll be glad to stand for additional questions. The President talked about admissions standards on the Columbia campus. What does that mean and what does that say about admissions standards on the regional campuses, and what ought to be the proper and appropriate relationship between and among the campuses in that regard?

Let me tell you what my personal view is about that. While I think we ought to be concerned about raising standards everywhere, I think - and I've said this to you, individually to the deans, and to John Duffy - I think it would be a mistake for the regional campuses to emulate to the letter the admissions standards that have been put in place at Columbia. I think that would be very self-defeating. One of the whole purposes of being a university system is to provide access, both in terms of geographical location and in terms of ranges of ability - maintaining a floor of academic preparedness for students who can ultimately succeed in winning and earning a baccalaureate degree.

In a sense, what I would suggest as the appropriate model for the regional campuses is, in a sense what we're doing here with our provisional year, where we have a projected grade point average of 2.0 to get in. In fact, that would have been, two years ago, a regular admit to the Columbia campus. Those students have to take 30 hours in their freshman year. They're required to take University 101. They've got to make a 2.0 or they're out. It's a very tough and rigorous standard they have to meet. The fact is, because the students in that program have small classes, they have lots of individual attention, it's a very well administered program. The persistence rate toward graduation actually exceeds the average for the entire student body at Columbia.

To me, that is precisely the role that the regional campuses play. You admit students who are qualified and prepared for academic work that is a slightly less rigorous, or ought to be, a slightly less rigorous standard than what we expect at Columbia, because you provide resources in terms of additional attention that students who, coming in the normal track here, those students who are in between the provisional year and the Honors College, that middle range, and who are at the lower end of that middle range, may not receive. With the additional attention that you are able to provide those students, they do succeed and they do persist and they wind up either in a baccalaureate degree program here or at some other four-year institution in South Carolina, or they stay in your location and earn a four-year degree through one of the delivery mechanisms that we have in place on the regional campuses.

To me, that is the purpose and the reason for having a geographically disbursed university. Otherwise, that may be, ultimately, the only reason to have a geographically disbursed university. That's really why I think this university is structured the way it is and that is our purpose.

Now, I think one of the critical questions that each of our campuses needs to ask itself, and one of the questions that the study committee will certainly ask, is what is our position on remedial work? At what point are we expending expensive resources, tenured track or tenured faculty, teaching 8th and 9th and 10th grade mathematics and English? To what extent should those students not be at a university campus, but ought to be, in fact, at a technical school? That,

it seems to be, ought to be one of the issues we ought to be willing to talk about and, in fact, be willing to say we would be willing to move back from that. That is not a descriptor of a university. I think that's a question that I would urge you to consider as you do your own strategic planning. To what extent are the resources on your campus really being directed toward what is, essentially, high school level work?

I know that two of the concerns that some of you asked me to address are the requirement that we put in place that all new tenure-track appointments in the University carry the terminal degree, or its equivalent. To me, if we are to be the university that we claim to be, if we are to identify ourselves as the University of South Carolina, and be a distinctive entity that is quite different in terms of its culture and its standards and sets us apart from any technical college in this state, that kind of doctorally-prepared or MFA-prepared faculty is a sine qua non. That describes who we must be to be a university of the first class that serves this state.

I will also concede that in putting that policy in place, it was pointed out to me that I should have come to this faculty and asked you to make that change in your faculty manual, and I confess that may be a valid criticism of the way the policy was implemented. If it is so, I will take responsibility for it. I believe it is, in fact, I sense very little disagreement that it is the right position for us to be. I will also concede that there are certain areas, if a dean comes, or John Duffy comes to me and says, "Look, in this particular field, we can't find terminal degree prepared people for these valid reasons," or "This person is so eminently qualified and provides such qualities that are unique," obviously, we will look at those cases on an exception basis, because rules are made for exceptions and exceptions are the proof of any rule. There are, obviously, good and logical and justifiable exceptions to any general requirement.

But I think for us to continue to justify our existence as regional campuses, apart from two-year technical/vocational kinds of institutions, the quality of the faculty, and the expectations of those faculty, are, in fact, what sets us apart, which leads me to my second point.

The expectations of faculty. I know there is some sensitivity on this issue. What is, in fact, the expectation with regard to scholarship as it relates to teaching and service on the regional campuses? The question that was posed to me was, "Are you not interposing Columbia campus standards on regional campus faculty?" I would say, "No, we're not." What we're doing in my office as we read tenure and promotion dossiers is looking carefully at what your criteria say, that you do expect, obviously, that the central responsibility is teaching. We expect, therefore, and by the way, this has happened, and I complimented you last year on this, an incredible improvement in the documentation to support quality and effectiveness in teaching.

We said a couple years ago it's not good enough to say, "This person is an effective teacher." Demonstrate it through documentation - student evaluations and peer evaluations. I've watched carefully the discussions that are going on among you with regard to your own procedures for documenting and defining effectiveness. That's a very positive development, and I applaud you for that and urge you to continue that work.

Clearly, over 50% of your responsibility is directly related to teaching. That goes back to my first point about the real mission of these campuses being access points to the whole university and to higher education broadly conceived. And, clearly, because of the very nature of these campuses, essentially small faculty, small departments, you have large service responsibilities. You wear many hats as you carry out your duties both in the classroom and out of the classroom,

interacting with students, interacting with your communities in a number of ways that those of us on a larger campus don't do because we have more people to do lots of specialized things. You have to be generalists. The service responsibilities are, therefore, greater.

Having said all that, there is still an expectation of scholarship or creativity, however it may be defined. I think the issue for all of us ought to be not the quantity of that scholarship, but rather the quality of it. Of course, we recognize that a scientist, without the laboratory facilities that would be available to a scientist on a research campus, would not be expected to do the same kind of work. We also recognize that because of the emphasis of teaching that research that impacts pedagogy and pedagogical research may be a larger component of scholarship on a teaching-emphasis campus than it is on a research campus.

All of those things are true, but our point is that when you say that you expect some aspect of scholarship, that ought to be there. That ought to be part of the definition of what a university faculty member is. That, in a sum, is the position that we've taken. My colleague is Don Griner, for whom I rely on many things in my office, he's Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, which means he has a direct responsibility for the regional campuses, and also one of my senior advisors on tenure/promotion issues. Don, do you want to add anything to what I've just said?

Associate Provost Don Griner: No, you've expressed it well. I was talking with the Salkahatchie faculty just this past Wednesday and the same question came up when you were there. The issue was not that Columbia was trying to rewrite criteria of the local units, as is the case on the Columbia campus with defining the criteria. But once the criteria are defined, and we're going to read the file in light of the criteria. Had the criteria called for research or creative activity, all we're looking for is evidence of it, and not the finesse.

The same parallel would pertain with the teaching. We're looking at the evidence of teaching rather than just a rhetorical statement that this person is a good teacher.

Professor Jerry Dockery , Lifelong Learning: What came out of your office is not consistent with what just came out of your mouth. It's obvious that what came out of your office was that teaching may have been most important, but certainly research was elevated to at least number two.

Provost Moeser: What are you referring to that came out of our office?

Professor Dockery: The files that were turned down at your office.

Provost Moeser: Jerry, I'm just not going to respond to any comments about individual files.

Professor Dockery: I didn't mean an individual. The reasons for the files, not individuals, but the files being turned down seemed to be centered on research.

Provost Moeser: Key back to statements in the very criteria that were written by the campuses.

Professor Dockery: Which says teaching is number one and the other areas are not ranked at all.

Provost Moeser: I don't think we quarreled with that. But where there was an absence of scholarship, we simply pointed that out. We've also talked in the past, there was some noise in the system about - actually, I should point out that some of the noise was not with my office, but with the regional campus committee, faculty committee on tenure promotion on early promotions or early decisions with regard to tenure. That's an issue that my office really didn't get involved with, but it was, I think the perception is that all the negative decisions stopped in my office. That's really not the case.

Professor Dockery: In fact, there was an inconsistency among the campuses on what, in fact, was on time, and what was early.

Provost Moeser: We look forward to a continuing discussion on this issue. I will tell you that we are having the same discussions with the departments on this campus. Every department continues to believe, in some cases, that there should never be any difference of opinion once a file leaves the local level. We look, obviously, scrupulously at all files. We are always guided by what the criteria say at the unit level.

And I will say to you the same thing I said to the college deans and that the college deans are saying to their department chairs. I hope that you will, as a faculty, continue to examine and self-examine your own departmental, or in this case, campus T & P criteria. I believe that standards, we should, as a university, be constantly, gradually raising those standards. I don't think we should do that to the disadvantage of people who are already in the system. But these things go hand-in-hand. Expecting that our new appointees will be terminally prepared eliminates the ABD, eliminates the time that faculty spend working on a PhD while they are engaged in fulltime teaching which, in the case of a four + four teaching level, means they never finish the degree. That really sort of puts all of that behind us. We have already, in that issue, raised a standard for those new appointees. Then we should have an expectation of them. I think it's important for deans, in talking with new faculty, to say, "Yes, we expect teaching. But we also want to see some evidence of the continuation of scholarship, so that seven years from now, you are still the scholar that you were when you completed that degree, that you're not just teaching material that is seven years old." In many fields, material that is seven years old is as outdated as material that is seventy years old.

Roy Darby, Beaufort: I worked on the Ad Hoc Committee on teaching effectiveness for the last several years and I would like to thank you. We recently received your response, Dr. Duffy, to our work from last year and I found your comments to be positive and, obviously, you read the document carefully and thoughtfully.

Provost Moeser: Likewise. As you know, my comments were relatively minor because I thought it was an excellent document and it showed real work on your committee's part.

Professor Darby: Thank you.

Professor John Catalano, Lancaster: When we spoke a couple weeks ago, we also spoke about the re-enactment of the System Academic Advisory Committee which you called incredibly tedious last year. Remember?

Provost Moeser: Yes.

Professor Catalano: Will we expect re-enactment of that?

Provost Moeser: Well, I'd like to discuss that with you, because I did discuss that with the Faculty Advisory Committee at Columbia just this week. The issue that John, let me just raise this issue. John and a group of faculty asked me to reinstate that group specifically to study the grading policy university-wide. The question that was raised to me by the Columbia faculty, which I relate back, do you not now use the same grading policy as Columbia since you are under the same catalog?

Professor Catalano: First of all, the answer to that is yes. But, actually, we use that as an example of something this committee might do when you asked what was there to do.

Provost Moeser: I'd like to hear you discuss this for a moment. If reconstituting this, or something like this committee, is an important avenue of keeping the academic dialogue going, then maybe it is something we should do. Do you share that view?

Professor Catalano: It was tedious from the standpoint of trying to get the two 4-year campuses, you all and five full professors from Columbia to agree on procedural steps, a common set of procedures, for faculty grievances. We did it, but it was tedious, because we were dealing with commas and semicolons and the definition of a workday and really critical issues like that.

Ellen Chamberlain, Beaufort: I think there are a lot of issues that we would like to see such a committee address, saying that grading wouldn't be top on my list, although I am sure that is important. But certainly articulation of questions and questions that affect the entire system, admissions standards which you mentioned before, certainly faculty questions, expectations of faculty. There are many, I think, questions that impinge upon all of us that we would like to have such a committee address. Perhaps with the planning cycle you were mentioning earlier, that might be the avenue that you would take to start this dialogue. And we're going to start it here, this year, in this body, by identifying issues through a faculty survey, and by focusing on planning, we will have been able to bring to the table the faculty opinion and position perhaps on many of the issues.

Provost Moeser: Maybe what we could look at, since there is, quite frankly and candidly, the relationship between the five regionals and Columbia is quite different than our relationship with Spartanburg and Aiken, which are not incorporated in our accreditation and with whom we have very little academic discussion, because of their almost autonomous nature. Maybe the discussion, Marcia, might be a Columbia/Regional Campus discussion.

Professor Marcia Welsh, Columbia: When the committee got together before, I think all the faculty have to understand that we bargain. We'll take a little of this, you take a little of that, and I think the regional campuses and Columbia worked pretty well working that out. But when we hit the four-year campuses, we kept hitting a wall. I think this is where we have a better chance with some of this.

Professor Carolyn West, Sumter: I think it was a place where we found that we could have a dialogue. There are many issues in here, because of the structural arrangement between this body and the Columbia Faculty Senate, that we do not get to discuss and that we do not get to be involved in. Sexual harassment policy is an example of that. There was bloodletting on the floor of this body for two meetings before it was discovered that the policy had already been passed in Columbia and the issues that we were discussing were moot.

What happens is the people who go to the Columbia Faculty Senate are representatives of their individual campuses. Therefore, there is no real connection between this body and the Columbia Faculty Senate. That committee allows a dialogue to go on about issues that are common for the whole system and makes the people in the regional campuses feel more participant in the system.

Provost Moeser: I think I'm hearing something that we can constructively respond to, Marcia, which is both an administrative and a Senate issue, that perhaps we could find a way to construct an organ that really does allow for communication, both administratively and for faculty for the two Senates.

Professor David Hunter, Regional Campus Office: John Duffy, you can help me with my recollection, but if I'm not mistaken, the actual genesis of that original committee dealt with a regional campus student who the past administration could not convince one of the four-year campuses to treat in an equitable manner. So it's the very things we're talking about. It took on a bigger issue almost immediately that had to do with defining residency within the system. I've always viewed it as something we had the structure in place as it is, and a lot of times, the committee works with the idea of, there are flaws in any structure, and this is one way to collegially address this. I think, if I could add a bit of history to that, this is really where this thing came from to begin with.

Professor Jane Upshaw, Beaufort: Another issue which this committee can facilitate is providing an understanding of our role in the system as well as Columbia's role to us in terms of academic concerns. Many times, the Columbia faculty don't know what we do and they unfortunately view Midlands Tech as their regional campus as opposed to our campuses. If they have a chance to meet us and talk to us, then they understand and are very open to sharing ideas, talking about joint grant opportunities, conducting research together. But they have to know about us, and such a committee offers an opportunity for that to happen.

Provost Moeser: You said, I would like to just pick up on one word that you said, and I hope that you will invite, at an early meeting, Dr. Marsha Ton, who is the new Vice Provost of

Research. Many of you have already met her because she has been to all of the campuses. She is really dedicated to making this a single university with regard to research. As you know, she's had a number of retreats at the Bauruch Institute where faculty have been invited, across college lines and disciplinary lines, and we've had faculty from all campuses. She intends to put a presence of the research office on every campus so that we can provide better service to faculty who want to be active in research, especially if you want to apply for funded research.

She has said, and I will just pass this on to you, because I think it will apply to you as well, that for any faculty member who writes a grant proposal for \$25,000 or more who receives an excellent rating on that grant proposal, whether or not it is funded, she will give you a \$500 travel grant. This is an incentive to inspire the submission of more grant proposals. At the same time, we want to find ways for those of you who are really interested in pursuing serious research projects to link you up, recognizing one of the problems you have is that you're isolated - you may be the only person on your campus who does what you do - to be able to link you up with colleagues within the University at different locations to put together joint proposals.

That, of course, brings to mind a T & P issue. I'll loop back. One of our concerns, and it's a very real concern on the main campus, is that we don't want faculty who are engaged in interdisciplinary projects to be penalized by their departments because they are doing something that's broad in nature. That's a problem for us. It may be actually less of a problem for you because you're more used to that.

We want to try to find ways to facilitate your success in pursuing your scholarly and research interests, and we're very serious about that. She wants to do everything she can to be helpful to you, individually as well as in groups.

I think we will take these suggestions for, John, it may not be the committee as it was structured in the past, but something like that, to create that ongoing method of conversation, both administratively and faculty. I think it is a very constructive suggestion.

Anything else?

Professor Robert Castleberry, Sumter: I wanted to make sure I heard you correctly when you first started off. You said, I think, a number of important things. I thought I heard you say something akin to the futures committee will be applied to the regional campuses next year.

Provost Moeser: Only in the sense that we want to integrate you into the strategic planning process that we'll be doing in Columbia. In other words, what I envision, each campus will write its own strategic plan, three-year period. We will give some response back to an early draft form to say, "Yes, we think this is good," or "No, we think you're off the road." Ultimately, we'll have a hearing and your plans will be knit together with all the colleges at Columbia into a single strategic plan for the University about where we're going as a university.

Professor Castleberry: The second comment was that this is not so much for fund allocation as occurred on the Columbia campus, but more for the planning process.

Provost Moeser: Although it will be linked to budget. It will be linked to budget in a slightly different way for you, because you have separate budget lines. The implications for Columbia are,

there is still the potential for reallocation within the Columbia campus budget. Your budgets, as you know, are totally separate and driven entirely by student EFT and your own tuition. But what we'll be looking for is, actually the horizon is essentially the same for everybody.

The best we're going to get from the State of South Carolina, I think it's what Dr. Palms just articulated, the best we could get from this state is stability keyed to the cost of living. If we could get a three-year commitment from the state, for example, that says, "We'll leave your budgets alone. Don't expect any windfalls, but we'll leave you alone and we won't threaten you," then we could plan. We could say, "This is what we plan to do. We will stop doing this so we could do that. We'll try to reach this point."

For example, in the case of Campus X, what if we stopped, what if we cut out doing all this remedial work? Is that a cost or a benefit in terms of the budget? I don't really know the answer to that in some cases. What if we stopped doing that? What could we do in its place? Or if we did more distance continuing education and generating more non-traditional students, generating more tuition dollars, what would we do with that additional money? What would we add, what value would we add to what is going on here now? Would we address these technology issues? What are our facilities needs, and what is the relationship of the facilities we have?

Beaufort, obviously, is a very interesting case because the whole demography of Beaufort and Jasper Counties is changing dramatically, and will in the next two decades. I know there is significant planning already going on down there. How do we integrate that plan into a larger university plan? What are the resource implications? What degree programs should we be thinking about offering there? What are the physical facilities that will be required to do that? Where is that money going to come from? That's the kind of thinking.

Professor Castleberry: An extension of this is the third part, which is that you believe that planning has occurred without a clean link to Columbia in the past and you hope this will change and, lastly, that instead of looking at four-year status, it's more like availability of four-year programs. Now I can ask, I guess, the question. Why do you think that planning has not been as well carried out between regional campuses and Columbia as you think it should?

Provost Moeser: I think we all bear responsibility for that. I don't really think we've had a very good mechanism for doing that. I think it's been, I don't think it's been a coordinated planning process. As I've watched the campus plans as they've come in, I haven't even seen the campus plans before they ultimately went to the Commission on Higher Education. They just kind of got, they come in April, get put in a book and we send them up. We've done the kind of planning that nobody pays any attention to, because it's essentially meaningless planning. It hasn't led to anything. We haven't really made a major effort, in my opinion, in doing it system-wide. The only exception I would make to that is what we did on this campus three years ago. I think we can do a much better job, and I think we can link it to real initiatives which will cause us to ask some really tough questions to the plans that are submitted.

President Palms: I think part of it is the roller coaster budgeting process that we've experienced. We've been threatened with 5% cuts. We've been held to a level. We've been worried about

vetoed. Clemson lost \$3.5 million after the Legislature passed the budget. The Governor just vetoed it out. If we had lost \$3.5 million, the tone of this meeting would be completely different right now. We'd be in a crisis situation. That's we're asking the Legislature. Give us something so we can do this kind of planning. It's pointless to call you into planning when we know there's no money and nothing can be done anyway, we're just trying to hang on and get salary increases and hold our former level of budgeting to just stable. There's no incentive to doing that. We'd just be wasting your time, in my opinion.

Bill Bowers, Salkehatchie: Dr. Moeser, as we debate and, hopefully, enhance T & P and hiring criteria, is it appropriate to consider salary, or should that remain totally separate?

Provost Moeser: No, salary is an issue, too, clearly.

Professor Bowers: Should it be linked or remain separate?

Provost Moeser: Salary should always be, if you're asking me should salary be linked to performance and merit? Absolutely. In other words, I'm a staunch opponent of across-the-board step increases for faculty. I think there really should be a rigorous annual review and that salary ought to be linked to that. We're dedicated on our side to getting the state to appropriate funds for faculty staff salary increases every year. That's part of the stability. When we're talking about stable budgets, that means we have to grow salaries. There's a cost-of-living increase and that's got to be part of our stable budget. But that needs to be, those awards need to be linked to an evaluation of performance.

Bob Costello, Sumter: I wonder if you could comment briefly on the relationship of the regional campuses to the technical colleges, particularly in terms of the Hilton Head operation. What's the University policy and intentions about that?

Provost Moeser: We have a meeting on Hilton Head, as a matter of fact, next week. We have some concerns about the Hilton Head Consortium, and we're going to meet with the leaders of that board next week.

Bruce Nims, Lancaster: President Palms mentioned something about post-tenure review in his remarks and you did not address that specifically.

Provost Moeser: I've asked the University Committee on Tenure Promotion on the Columbia campus to look at the issue first of all for Columbia. My view is that, and I'll address both your question and the question that was raised earlier about the whole concern about tenure in terms of the bill in the Legislature. I'm told that there were as many as twenty different bills, that this was not a South Carolina phenomenon. There were at least twenty different bills introduced in legislatures around the country to abolish tenure.

My view is that we can, first of all, let me say that I believe strongly in the efficacy of tenure as the most important safeguard of academic freedom. Academic freedom is the reason

tenure exists. It is not job security or job protection. We must never present it as job protection. That's not what it is about. It is about protecting our freedom as academics to take unpopular or controversial positions.

Having said that, I agree with everything the President said about the public's view. Tenure is not well understood in the public sector and that misunderstanding, or lack of understanding, is clearly reflected in political opinion. It's not unthinkable that this prairie fire that starts could really burn and get out of control. I believe our best posture is to be able to say to the Legislature, "We are rigorous, number one, we are rigorous in our decision making about tenure. We do not award tenure lightly. We continue to have high expectations of faculty who are tenured, that they meet the expectations as stated in our faculty manuals about what it is, what is required, doing one's job." And you know what that means. We are looking at some mechanism, which I believe wouldn't even require a change in the faculty manual, because we're already required to do annual evaluations of all faculty. That's a state requirement. That's actually a legal requirement of the state, and we've made it a policy requirement of the University - that every faculty member should receive a written evaluation from his or her dean or department chair every year. That's part of the merit evaluation we were just talking about.

In a number of universities - we're looking at what some other universities have already put in place. We've got policies now from the University of Kentucky, the University of Virginia, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Hawaii, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and a number of other places, and I can tell you there are probably twenty other major institutions that are also studying this issue, and there are a number of national organizations. I believe we will be able to say that within our existing policies of annual review, and with some mechanisms for peer review of faculty, either on a regular basis or for faculty who are clearly just not meeting their expectations, again, for some kind of peer review to set in process a faculty development model, I want to key our mechanism not on a legalistic system that says we're going to nail people and terminate them, but rather, that says if people have fallen behind for one reason or another, that we will work out a faculty development plans for them over a three-year cycle and help bring them on. We all know that there are things that happen in the course of a personal life and an academic career. We all know about burnout. We know about changes in careers where once one was highly productive, they've stopped being productive, but with a chance for some meaningful redevelopment, that people can redirect their lives and redirect their careers and are not lost. I want to view this in a positive, and not a negative, sense.

But, ultimately, we will take seriously the language that is in the faculty manual. In all of our faculty manuals, a faculty can be dismissed for cause, if they are, in fact, not meeting the obligations of their responsibility to the institution. That is a very rigorous process, as it should be.

But I think our best defense for tenure is to say that we are rigorous, both at the front end and in the continuing monitoring of ourselves. This is a peer review process. This is basically something that faculty do. We are a self-regulated profession. We can stave off legislative intrusion into this affair by taking that kind of posture. Thank you very much.

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST
REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
John N. Gardner
TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
September 8, 1995

**REQUIREMENT OF THE TERMINAL DEGREE FOR NEW REGIONAL CAMPUS
FACULTY APPOINTMENT**

As a result of the administration's review of tenure and promotion requests during the preceding academic year, it was realized that there were some units recommending faculty for tenure and/or promotion who did not hold a terminal degree. As a result, this led to a review of the entire policy throughout all campuses of the University of awarding tenure and/or appointments to the tenure track for individuals who do not hold an appropriate terminal degree. The administration solicited input from unit administrators, and the Regional Campuses did present to the administration, both verbally and in writing, a number of concerns we had about this particular proposed policy. Your Associate Deans for Academic Affairs were particularly helpful to this office in strongly representing your views and practices in this regard. As a result, the administration has adopted a policy that it will be necessary for an individual to have the appropriate terminal degree in order to be appointed to the terminal track. However, exceptions in the best interests of the University can be made upon the approval of the Provost. A copy of the official policy is attached to this report.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COURSES

For a number of years we have had difficulty obtaining approval from the College of Criminal Justice for appropriate individuals to teach lower-level Criminal Justice on the Regional Campuses (with the exception of USC Lancaster, which has its own Associate Degree in Criminal Justice). For the past year the College of Criminal Justice has been "under new management." The policy of that unit with respect to the approval of Criminal Justice courses on the Regional Campuses is currently under review. With the assistance of your Associate Deans for Academic Affairs, this office will be working collaboratively with the Interim Dean of the College of Criminal Justice, Professor Blease Graham, to present additional information to the Criminal Justice faculty, and hopefully, to encourage them to offer such approvals and to work collaboratively with them towards the development of an upper division series of courses to be offered via Distance Education. We will keep you posted on the progress of these discussions.

2001 CAMPAIGN

Currently, under President Palm's leadership, the University administration is working very hard on a major capital campaign, 2001 Campaign. The President is making at least 70 speeches around the state on this topic and will be in all of your communities to do so if he has not been already. The administration is very optimistic about the prospects for the successful conclusion

of this campaign. We are strongly encouraged to actively raise money in our communities as part of this campaign, said monies to be used for the campuses in our respective communities and/or as stipulated by the donor(s).

CONCEPT OF FOUR YEAR DEGREE PROGRAMS

Particularly at that impetus of the Sumter campus, there has been considerable ongoing discussion about the desirability of offering additional opportunities for students on the Regional Campuses to pursue baccalaureate degree attainment. Currently it is not the policy of the University administration to seek four year status for any of the Regional Campuses or to encourage them to develop their own four year degrees. However, we do have strong support for the development of additional collaborative arrangements with the baccalaureate degree granting campuses of the University to develop four year degree "programs" as opposed to four year "degrees". This is more than a semantic distinction as I am sure all of you can fully appreciate.

REVIEW OF THE MISSION OF THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES IN TERMS OF TEACHING/RESEARCH VIS A VIS TENURE & PROMOTION ACTIONS

During this past spring's process of review by the administration of Regional Campuses faculty applications for tenure and/or promotion, questions were raised by the administration about the meaning of the wording of the criteria for the ranks of Associate and Full Professor in the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual. In particular, questions were raised about the phrase "a faculty member must have a record of effective performance usually involving both teaching and other professional achievements such as research, creativity, or performance in the arts." Vice Provost Duffy and I met separately •- with Provost Moeser to explain the practice of the Regional Campuses Faculty Committees with regard to their interpretation of this criteria. In addition, much more recently, a subcommittee° of faculty leaders from the Regional Campuses met directly with the Provost and Vice Provost Duffy to discuss this matter and the Chair of this subcommittee will be reporting directly to the Senate on this matter. This office is certainly very willing to continue to work with both the faculty and the administration to achieve greater consensus on the meaning of the criteria for the respective ranks of the Regional Campuses Faculty.

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RETREAT

The Vice Provost, Mary MacDonald, and I met with the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate Executive Committee in August and from our perspective it was an extremely positive and productive gathering. We look forward to these annual events and believe this is one of the truly unique features of our Regional Campuses Unit. This retreat contributes significantly to the collegiality which we all enjoy. I believe it is more appropriate for our faculty leadership to report on the specific actions taken by this retreat, but we did want you to know how much we enjoyed participating in this event.

USC COLUMBIA FRESHMAN CONVOCATION & FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCE READING GROUP

This fall for approximately the fifth or sixth year USC Columbia held an opening freshman convocation on August 20. I believe it was the most effective gathering yet. This includes a formal transmission of the Carolinian Creed conferred by the President of the Student Government Association to a member of the freshman class; the most recent recipient of the Amoco Foundation Outstanding Teaching Award gives an address to the students; and the President and the Provost convey a number of their thoughts on the meaning and the significance of the University educational experience. I am delighted to report that three of our campuses, Lancaster, Sumter, and Salkehatchie, also have a convocation. I hope the faculty who participated in these activities will share what they do with faculty from the other Regional Campuses.

Also, this year at USC Columbia, for the second year in a row we invited approximately 500 freshmen to participate in what we're calling the First Year Reading Experience. These students (approximately 300 from University 101 and approximately 200 from the Honors College) were asked to read Josephine Humphries novel Rich In Love over the summer. Then on Monday, August 21 they had the opportunity to hear Ms. Humphries speak to them about her life as a writer; then the students were broken into small groups of approximately 10 each with a faculty member for a 90 minute discussion of the book. Those two events were followed by a complimentary luncheon and then the day was concluded by the showing of the film Rich In Love with an academic interpretation by Professor Dan Berman of the Department of Media Arts. Of course Regional Campuses faculty and students could participate in a first year reading experience program if we had any interest in designing one for our own campuses. The University officer who is in charge of administering this program is Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, Donald Griener. I am sure he would be delighted to talk to any faculty on our campuses about this concept.

FACULTY EXCHANGE PROGRAM PROPOSALS

Each fall during the period between the two Faculty Senate meetings the notices go out soliciting applications for the Faculty Exchange Program. I would anticipate that you would receive these sometime late September or early October and they are customarily due, through channels, to the Provost's Office by December 1. This has been an extraordinarily important faculty development initiative for the Regional Campuses for nearly 20 years. I hope some of you will give it serious consideration this year. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me as I am your representative in the review process.

ANNUAL PRESIDENT'S RECEPTION FOR FACULTY

This event will be held on Thursday, October 11, from 6:30 pm until 9:30 pm at the President's House on the Horseshoe. As always, Regional Campuses faculty are encouraged to attend.

PERIODIC MEETINGS OF REGIONAL CAMPUSES ADMINISTRATORS

This is to remind you that the Deans of the University have a monthly meeting in Columbia; the Academic Deans have one meeting per semester; the Student Affairs Deans also have one meeting per semester. If you have any items you would like discussed or considered at any of these meetings, please bring them to my attention. The schedule for these meetings is as follows:

<u>Deans of the University</u>	<u>Academic Deans</u>	<u>Student Affairs Deans</u>
September 21	October 6	October 27
October 12		
November 16		
December 14		

UNIVERSITY 101 WORKSHOP

The next University 101 "Teaching Experience Workshop" will be held at USC Columbia, December 18 - 21, 1995. There will also be one May 6 - 10, 1996. As always, our faculty are most cordially invited to attend. for the first time or for a "refresher" course. Please contact me if you are interested.

TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

The procedures set forth below governing tenure and promotions shall apply to all undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools, colleges, or divisions of the University of South Carolina except the Four-Year Campuses and the Regional Campuses. The primary responsibility for the operation of all tenure and promotion procedures shall rest with the tenured members of the faculty of each department or nondepartmentalized school or college. Final authority for recommending tenure or promotion to the University Board of Trustees shall reside with the President. Final authority for approving recommendations of tenure and promotion rests with the Board of Trustees.

Tenure and promotion decisions are the most important made by the University, for they will determine the quality of the faculty for decades to come. While the decision to promote a faculty member rests largely on an assessment of evidence of past achievements or promise, the decision to tenure rests largely on anticipation of continued professional growth and development in directions of special relevance -o the core missions of the unit and University.

Departments and colleges are urged to be very selective in their recommendations, particularly for tenure. The three prime missions of the University are teaching, research, and service. In any promotion process, consideration should be given to performance in all three of these areas. However, the three need not be treated equally and their application depends upon the definition of the position to which the individual has been appointed and to which the candidate is to be promoted.

The University is committed to achievement in all three areas of its mission. For many faculty members service is a major function, interrelated with both teaching and scholarship. Through service professors integrate, communicate, and apply the scholarly knowledge they have discovered. As a result of service, they review and revise their discoveries theories. Both teaching and scholarship are beneficiaries. Collectively, the faculty profile of the University and of any academic unit should reflect a record of high quality teaching, research, and service, but because it is generally recognized that the strength of any University lies in its diversity of talents, not every faculty member need demonstrate

exemplary achievements or promise in each of them. Promotion and tenure will generally be awarded, so long as the evidence presented shows that a candidate's research/scholarship/performance accomplishments are excellent and the candidate's teaching and service are also strong, or if a candidate's teaching accomplishments are excellent and the candidate's research/scholarship/performance and service accomplishments are also sufficiently strong to meet the requirements for promotion or tenure.

It will be unusual and exceptional to award promotion and tenure merely on the basis of strong performance in only one of these areas. In every instance, the record of teaching, research (scholarship or creative performance), and service shall be thoroughly documented, with unit criteria regarding what constitutes high quality, and with UCTP guidelines to serve as the basis for such decisions.

Several methods of evaluation should be used, and the record should be thorough enough to indicate not just past performance, but a reasonable likelihood of continued excellence.

Faculty members who are in positions that are primarily public service oriented should be evaluated with heavy emphasis placed on the quality of performance of the service provided. The faculty member with primarily public service responsibilities should be able to make a case for the quality of the public service work and how it relates to research and/or teaching. When teaching is a primary part of public service, the activity should be judged on criteria adapted from the evaluation of instruction.

Promotion to associate professor should be requested only if individuals show real promise that they will become leading teachers, researchers, scholars, or creative artists. Promise should, in fact, be substantiated by tangible, developing evidence. Promotion from associate professor to professor should [normally] be based upon promise fulfilled. A move to the rank of professor should be accompanied by evidence of attainment of national or international stature in a field.

In summary, scholarship, teaching, and service are all to be considered at the time of promotion and/or tenure. The University

cannot expect every faculty member's performance to be outstanding in all these functions. But if a candidate is weak in teaching or scholarly achievement--whether it be in research, scholarship, or creative performance--it should be recognized that promotion or the awarding of tenure may not be in the best interest of the University.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TENURE AND PROMOTIONS (See also p. 17)

Organization. The University Committee on Tenure and Promotions is composed of 24 members, all full professors with tenure. Fifteen members are elected by the faculty and nine appointed by the President. No more than three elected members may be from any single college or school except the College of Humanities and Social Sciences which may have up to six elected members. The elected members are nominated by a special nominating committee composed of the members of the Faculty Advisory Committee, the Faculty Welfare Committee, and the eight persons completing their terms on the Tenure and Promotions Committee. The nominating committee nominates a slate of ten names. The voting members of the faculty elect five persons each year. Each voting faculty member may vote for any number of persons up to the total of seats to be filled.

No person shall serve more than three years consecutively. The committee shall establish the procedures and provisions for filling temporary vacancies on the committee.

Functions. The University Committee on Tenure and Promotions publishes general guidelines for criteria and procedures for the operation of tenure and promotion policies at the departmental level. These are submitted to the University Faculty and the Board of Trustees for approval. The committee formulates procedures for the operation of these regulations.

The committee approves departmental tenure and promotion criteria and procedures.

The committee receives recommendations for promotion and tenure through the appropriate administrative officers (department chairs,

deans, and the Provost) of the University, who forward the results of all votes and statements by the appropriate faculty together with any endorsements as may be desired, but they must forward all recommendations and endorsements previously submitted. The committee forwards its recommendations to the Office of the President.

The file of any person dissatisfied with a negative decision by the originating (e.g., departmental) committee, upon request to such committee, shall be sent through all appropriate channels for endorsement to the President for appropriate action. The University Grievance Committee hears appeals from any person dissatisfied with the decisions made regarding tenure or promotion (See "Academic Grievance Procedure", pp. ~~29-36~~ .)

The proceedings of the University committee on Tenure and Promotions are confidential with respect to all written materials reviewed and all discussions of individual cases by the committee. Failure to maintain confidentiality shall be sufficient grounds for removal from the committee. The committee has the authority to remove members for such reason.

Guidelines for Departmental and College Policy. The tenured members of each department or other appropriate academic unit formulate specific criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion. These are forwarded through appropriate channels (dean, Provost) to the University committee for approval. After approval, each such department or unit is responsible for following the approved procedure. Tenured faculty within departments or schools may elect to operate as a committee of the whole or through select committees, based on the entire unit or significant academic subdivision (e.g., programs). No select committee may have fewer than five members where possible, all committees shall have representation at both the rank of professor and associate professor. Departments or units with fewer than five tenured members are required to submit to the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions a policy for approval which the department shall thereafter follow until it has five or more tenured members.

The election of the chair of the department and/or college tenure and promotion committee for a given academic year must occur by the last day of spring semester classes. The name of each department

and/or college tenure and promotion committee chair will be reported to the Provost and UCTP chair by May 15. These changes in procedure will facilitate the early training of the department and/or college chairs.

A candidate and the academic unit should follow UCTP guidelines for putting files together. These guidelines include among other things that the unit is responsible for 1) providing a synthesis of evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance and a summary of supporting evidence in the file; 2) providing assessment for the candidate's professional performance from appropriate referees employed outside the University.

At the unit level, all nontenured faculty are considered for tenure, and all faculty members below the rank of professor are considered for promotion each year. Consideration at the departmental or unit level is automatic unless the faculty member requests that consideration by the local unit be deferred until the following year. Potential candidates for tenure and/or promotion should be advised in writing by the appropriate dean or department chair by April 15 of the timetable for the submission and consideration of files. Using this system of early notification, each individual will have ample time to decide the question of candidacy, and those choosing candidacy will have every opportunity to prepare a well organized file. This early notification of candidates will be in addition to the official notification of potential candidates which is performed by the appropriate dean or department chair at least one month in advance of the date when the file is due (see below).

A candidate's dossier and supporting materials will be sent forward administratively only if the appropriate committee recommends promotion and/or tenure. A list of those persons considered but not recommended must be forwarded through appropriate channels for the record. Failure to recommend favorably at a particular time is without prejudice with respect to future consideration. Each eligible faculty member shall be given notice in writing by the appropriate dean or department chair at least one month in advance of consideration by appropriate faculty. Both the dean and

department chair shall be notified by the unit committee chair of the pending meeting of such committee, and they shall have the opportunity to place appropriate materials in the dossier of any individual.

In the matter of tenure, decisions of those of equal or higher rank of the departmental tenure and promotion committee are reported to the chair of the department or other appropriate administrator. Where the body has acted through a select committee, the department chair or other administrator has a secret ballot sent to all tenured members of equal or higher rank. Each such member shall vote "yes" or "no" or "abstain." Whether an abstention vote in units counts towards the total votes for candidates in determining an appropriate majority shall be decided at the unit level. A record of the votes is made in all instances and must be forwarded through appropriate channels. Written justification of all votes at the unit level (whether by select committee or committee of the whole) shall be mandatory.

In matters of promotion, decisions by those of higher rank are reported to the chair of the department or other immediate administrator. Where the body has acted through a select committee, the chair or other administrator has a secret ballot sent to all tenured members of higher rank. Each such member shall vote "yes" or "no" or "abstain." Whether an abstention vote in units counts towards the total votes for candidates in determining an appropriate majority shall be decided at the unit level. A record of the votes is made in all instances and must be forwarded through appropriate channels. Written justification of all votes at the unit level (whether by select committee or committee of the whole) shall be mandatory.

Recommendations from the promotion and tenure committee, including the recording of votes and all written comments, are forwarded to the chair of the department or administrator of the unit. The department chair or administrator of the unit may endorse such recommendations in any way desired, but must forward all such recommendations, statements, and endorsements through the appropriate administrative channels to the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions.

Amendments and Transitional Provisions. No change shall be made in

the University-wide tenure and promotion regulations except by vote of the full voting membership of the University -faculty or by direction of the Board of Trustees. In no event shall any change in tenure and promotion regulations be made retroactively for faculty hired before January 1, 1995, unless the faculty member chooses otherwise.

Faculty members hired into the tenure track after January 1, 1995 will be responsible within their probationary period for meeting the unit tenure and promotion criteria and University standards in effect at the time of their hiring. For all subsequent promotions the faculty member will be responsible for meeting unit criteria and University standards in effect at the time of their application for that promotion.

The Regional Campuses and Four-Year Campuses develop their own tenure and promotion policies and procedures. Their policies should adequately reflect the spirit of the Columbia campus policy and should be arrived at through consultation with the appropriate Faculty Senate. The policies and procedures, when devised, are presented to the University Board of Trustees for approval.

Dean Joe Pappin's Report

I regret that I can't be with you today for the Senate meeting, but I wish all members of the Senate well as you begin your work for me 1995-6 academic year. We have gotten off to a busy start this semester on the Lancaster campus; I'd like to share just a few of the highlights with you.

Special thanks goes to all those individuals who contributed to making this a successful Fall Registration, including those volunteers who manned the phone bank which Becky Parker, our Director of Enrollment Management, organized last month. Our final headcount has not yet been determined, but as of yesterday, Sept. 7, our headcount stood at 935. The final figure will of course be higher once we factor in all Gifted and Talented classes. Camden courses, second eight week courses, and the losses we are offering in Rock Hill.

Last week and this week, architects from the Watson-Tate firm have been visiting on campus and meeting with faculty, staff, and community members in preparation for their initial work designing the new classroom/auditorium building for our campus. If all goes well, we can expect construction to begin time early same time early in Fall 1996.

Last week we held our first University Convocation featuring Dr. John Stockwell, Chancellor of the University of South Carolina at Spartanburg who gave a fascinating and inspiring presentation to students and faculty on "Einstein and Forrest Gump: What It Means to be Human".

Three weeks ago, we received a \$100,000 check from the Lancaster County Council towards the construction of our much needed new roof for the P.E. Center. This new roof will cost about one quarter of a million dollars. We already had about \$113,000 in our capital Improvement budget, so together these two sums will cover the greater cast of the new roof. Construction on the new roof should begin In the next few weeks. Combining the sum above received from the Council with the new mill they have authorized for this year, which is worth about \$84,000, the total we'll receive this year from County Council is \$298.000 compared to \$114,000 from our Council last year. We are most grateful to the Lancaster County Council for their generous and crucial support. It could not come at a more Important time for USC-L.

Last Saturday, our Interim Dean of Academic and Student Affairs, Deborah Cureton, organized and led our first Adjunct Faculty Workshop. It was attended by about 30 adjunct faculty and proved to be very helpful to a pivotal group of individuals without whom we could not accomplish our primary mission of teaching. Making presentations at the workshop were, in addition to Dean Cureton, Bruce Nims, Becky Parker, Susan Snipes, and Shari Eliades. We appreciate the work of Jerry Currence, Wayne Thurman, and Bruce Nims with the adjunct faculty as well as the help of Lida Savage and Ed Wade In serving a lunch.

Again, best wishes to the Senate. I wish you all a pleasant and productive year.

Welfare Committee Report Kwame Dawes Sept. 8, 1995

Brief explanation of current circumstances. - Chair.

1. Charges passed on to the Welfare Committee had to be carefully examined and clarified as the Chair was not given the chance to attend the retreat where decisions were made. Nonetheless, the following actions were taken:

A. Charge I: Read document - Explain Welfare value and focus.

Action: Each rep. will return to their campus, review institutional approaches to faculty "promotion" and enhancement, public profile, etc. and details concerning the image of faculty in the communities. They will then bring reports to the next Senate meeting where a series of recommendations will be formulated for faculty and the various campus about how to enhance faculty community profile. The document will encourage greater community activity, greater focus and orchestration of such activity, and will target specific groups (political, civic, etc.) to inform about faculty life. Welfare issue explained.

B. Charge II: A report will be prepared for the Senate on salary issues. The charge will be to:

(a) Compare salaries of faculty on Regional Campuses with salaries on Columbia campus by rank and discipline.

(b) Compare salary differences between Faculty and Administration on Regional Campuses with those on Columbia campus.

(c) Evaluate the trend of these two salary concerns over a five to ten year period (depending on data availability) to see if there are patterns that we need to be concerned with.

C. Charge III: Charged to define "Scholarship." Decided to find out what other subcommittee are doing in the area of arriving at a definition. Also we will request that whatever is gleaned by other committee be passed on to Welfare to determine the extent to which it addresses and affects the welfare of faculty. Welfare will take available information, run it by faculty in regional campus and report to Senate on how we feel the ideas are impacting faculty welfare. We ask that no final decisions be made before running document through Welfare.

D. Charge IV: The committee will review the bylaws to understand the mandate of the Welfare Committee. This review will lead to discussion concerning how faculty can "access" the Welfare Committee for the regional campuses. The aim is to elevate the profile and role of this committee by passing information about its role to the Regional Campus faculty. The aim is to also energize the activity of this committee.

The document outlining this role and the faculty's "access" benefits will be completed AFTER the next Regional Campus Senate meeting.

Executive Committee Minutes

Executive Committee Retreat

The Regional Campuses Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at the Ocean Creek Library in Myrtle Beach, August 13-15. Chair Wayne Chilcote Reported on the Faculty Manual changes, Tenure and Promotion changes and additional duties of the Vice Chair. The AAUP Sexual Harassment policy was not approved for inclusion in the Manual. Henry Price, Don Griner and John Olsgaard have been invited to speak to the Senate. The Provost has addressed the question of hiring non-terminal degree faculty. The Chair shared a memo from the Provost which states his position on this matter. Provost Moeser's position is that all tenure-track candidates must have the doctorate of philosophy. Any exceptions to this rule must be cleared by his office. David Hissier has resigned his position on the Research and Productive Scholarship Committee. Tye Johnson will serve his term on this committee.

Dr. Duffy reported that Earl Holley has resigned and is going to Kennesaw College in Marietta, Georgia. He will be replaced by John Finan, a former Air Force General. The CHE is beginning its study of the state's higher education system. A committee has been appointed to examine the medical schools, engineering colleges, USC Sumter, and USC Beaufort. We have responded with our views.

The BAIS proposal is in the hands of the CHE Staff. The first level of review gave a unanimous recommendation to approve. This proposal was reviewed by the academic officers. Columbia has placed more emphasis on BAIS this year than previously which may be related to Dr. Duffy being the Dean of Applied Professional Sciences. If the CHE approves this proposal, the Campuses can advertise this degree and increase enrollment. In this proposal, it is reported that 90% of all BATS graduates are doing well having earned this degree. Dr. Duffy will continue in his dual role for the next academic year.

There is the pervasive perception that the new legislative leadership is against higher education. The University received about the same amount of money as last year. However, most of this money is considered soft money which could be reallocated. Funding was decreased to USC Sumter. Union and Salkehatchie received about the same this year while Lancaster and Beaufort received more money. Enrollment at USC Sumter is down. One reason is that this campus uses the same admissions standard as Columbia. The other campuses make more exceptions. Even USC Columbia has a larger number of exceptions than USC Sumter.

Dr. Duffy's office is investigating grant money to bring all campuses on-line. There will be disadvantages to having this technological up-grade. The disadvantage will be that there must be money spent to keep such a system current. The Regional Campuses office has been investigating delivering the Criminal Justice degree to Union, Lancaster, and Sumter. A proposal to utilize television to deliver this degree was turned down by the faculty in Columbia; however, some courses may be sent out over television. The question was asked why Beaufort was not included in such a proposal. John Gardner answered that Lancaster has an associate's degree in Criminal Justice; Union is getting a new Juvenile center; and Sumter has a history of providing these courses.

John Gardner reported that President Palms is currently traveling over the state making

presentations on the 2001 Campaign. There is a possibility that Carolina Plaza will be sold to the Legislature. If this happens, the Regional Campuses offices will be looking for another location.

John Gardner pointed out that there is growing concern over the decreased enrollments at Sumter. He asserted that the concern was due to the fact that some faculties continue to emphasize the need for increasingly higher standards.

The next order of business was a report from each campus. Beaufort is considering withdrawal from the Hilton Head College Center. Commissioner Sheheen is not happy and subsequent meetings have been arranged. The Center has provided no visible benefits for USC Beaufort. In fact, the College Center has become an obstacle to USCB's offering more four-year program. The two-year study pointed out that the Center seemed to be a waste of money. The Beaufort-Jasper Local Commission has voted not to support the Hilton Head College Center. In addition, the College of Charleston is offering four upper division art courses this fall without the Center having asked the current members to provide these courses. USC Beaufort provides the library resources at Hilton Head and the students from the other institutions have free access to these holdings. The final outcome of USCB's request, however, remains unresolved.

Ellen Chamberlain is offering an electronic course on the Internet this fall. This course will provide six weeks of 30 lessons and is expected to have a large national enrollment.

Sumter is studying how to absorb the technical college. The community in Sumter does not perceive the need for both institutions. The money which the technical school spends on advertising far exceeds what is spent by USC Sumter. The observation was made that the same is true state-wide. This certainly could be a cause of the enrollment declines at Sumter.

Sumter funding is a serious concern. All temporary personnel have been terminated. Robert Castleberry is the new chair of the faculty. Four-year status is not in the near future; however, baccalaureate degree programs are available.

Lancaster the Title III grant continues. There are physical renovations and building which is being planned on the Lancaster campus. Six million dollars will be spent. An architectural firm has been chosen for the project which includes science labs, a performing arts auditorium, offices and state-of-the-art-technology equipped classrooms. Enrollments are constant. The counseling center was closed on the campus this summer. However, there seems to be money available for other expenses which do not involve students or faculty. There has been a great deal of turnover in the staff with four having resigned

There are many rumors which are circulating in Lifelong Learning. There are stories being told that this part of the Regional Campus system no longer exist. The extent to which these rumors are true will only be born out by time. It is a fact that the faculty is shrinking.

At Salkehatchie, Bess Lawton has retired. The new director for Graduate Regional Studies is Susan Muskow.

- Union, they have had an increased profile in the community. Jean Denman is full-time faculty and is responsible for continuing education. She has expanded the continuing education offerings to industry. Tandy Willis is conducting an oral and written communication course for a local manufacturer. A new USC Union support organization has been formed and is working well. The campus does need to hire new faculty. There are plans in the community for a new juvenile center. Harold Sears is writing a recruitment handbook detailing college life.

The next matter discussed was a proposed meeting with the Provost concerning Tenure and Promotion issues. The purpose of this meeting would be to discuss the role of research in Tenure and Promotion files of Regional Campuses Faculty. The representatives to act as an ad hoc committee in this meeting were Wayne Chilcote, John Logue, Carolyn West, Tandy Willis, and John Catalano. John Catalan was selected to be chair of this committee. The Executive Committee asked that the policy concerning research for our T & P files be clarified. Specifically, the members should state that it seems that one or two negative votes are used to deny the candidates' tenure or promotion request. This same discussion also included the suggestion that if the perceptions are correct, the manual should be rewritten to include an accurate description of what is expected for promotion to each rank.

The committee charges for the coming year were discussed and finalized as the next order of business. Tandy Willis asked that the campuses be diligent about getting Dr. Duffy's evaluations returned. He reported that the committee wants a good return rate for this effort. Willis also reported that the Outside Activities Committee report adopted by the Senate has been accepted. The proposed meeting dates for the coming year are September 8 in Columbia, November 17 in Walterboro, February 16 in Sumter, and April 19 in Beaufort.

Executive Committee Meeting, September 8, 1995

During the Executive Committee's meeting today, we discussed two items. First was the date of the April Senate meeting to be held on Hilton Head. We recommend that the meeting date be changed to April 12 because April 19 is during Heritage Week. The second item comes to you as a request to each member of a special committee. The Executive Committee would like each representative of this body on a special committee to write a summary of your responsibilities for that committee. Please get this information to me so that I can attach these to the minutes of the next meeting.

Respectively submitted,

Jane T. Upshaw, Secretary

MEMORANDUM

From: Bruce Nims, USC-Lancaster
To: Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
Subject: Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries Date:
September 8, 1995

The Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries met on April 7, 1995, in the Mezzanine Conference Room of the Thomas Cooper Library. The main item for discussion was the Thomas Cooper Library's proposal for the use of the extra allocation from the Futures Committee. At the time, Thomas Cooper was expecting a 1.3 million dollar infusion, with \$800,000, or 62%, going to the enhancement and preservation of collections, \$350,000, or 27%, going to improving library services, and \$150,000, or about 11%, directed toward improving technology.

The Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries also met on April 24, 1995, in the Mezzanine Conference Room of the Thomas Cooper Library. The outgoing chair, Dr. Robert Weir of the Department of History, circulated a draft of the final report from the year's departmental visitations and the issues raised. The greatest area of concern seemed to be serials; faculty wanted to see more serials added and to be notified concerning possible cuts in serials. Faculty were also desirous of obtaining more citation indexes.

Dr. Patrick Scott of the Department of English distributed a draft of an Undergraduate Curriculum Information Literacy Proposal. The proposal is in response to survey data that show USC students to be below national norms in the quality of their library use. The proposal calls for the establishment of a University-wide Curriculum Standard for Information Literacy and discusses how such a standard might be implemented.

Vice-Provost Terry's report mentioned the enormous increase in the number of interlibrary loan requests over the past year. Some limitations may be placed on student use of this service. Vice-Provost Terry also noted that the DHEC library is closing and Thomas Cooper stands to be able to pick up some of that collection. Ex Libris, the library's annual publication, has also come out and copies were distributed. Finally, planning for the new library annex is continuing apace. The committee was shown a video of the Harvard Depository facility, which is considered a successful model.

Dr. Churchill Curtis of the College of Applied Professional Sciences was elected chair of the committee for next year.

**Report on Courses and Curricula Committee
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
September 8, 1995
Robert Castleberry**

I was not able to attend the summer meeting of the committee June 12, 1995, because of a workshop I was attending. However, the agenda for the meeting had indicated that the committee would not be working on anything that would adversely affect our campuses. The changes to the OADM program had already been addressed by this body. Formal actions by the Columbia Senate are found in the minutes of the July meeting of that body.

The Courses and Curriculum Committee met on August 7, 1995, and considered several changes to the Education-in-the-Art programs, mostly course and number changes. Some new marine science courses to support undergraduate research projects were approved by the committee at that meeting. A new IDST course for the BAIS program and Applied Professional Sciences was put on hold to get some additional information.

We are meeting again today at 2:00 p. m. Currently, the only items on the agenda involve a reconsideration of the proposed changes from Education, number changes for EDSE, Secondary Education Courses. Lastly, let me again remind you that you should peruse the minutes of the Columbia Senate to find out which proposed changes have become official. Thank you.

Regional Campus Faculty Senators

Name	Office No.	Email
Beaufort:		
Jane Upshaw	785-3995	jupshaw@univscvn.csd.scarolina.edu
Ellen Chamberlain	50-4121	ellenc@sc.edu
Roy Darby	521-4119	rcdarby@univscvn.csd.sc.edu
Sheila Tombe	521-4158	tombe-sheila@sc.edu
John Blair		
Babet Villena-Alvarez	521-4152	jalvarez@univscvm.csd.sc.edu
Chris Plyler	50-4114	
Lancaster:		
Bruce Nims		
Carolyn Taylor	285-7471	
Wayne D. Thurman	285-7471	
John Catalano	53-7040	llanc07@univscvm.csd.sc.edu
Union:		
Susan Smith	777-6864 or 429-8728	r700999@univscvm.csd.sc.edu
Jean Denman	429-8728 x32	r701010@univscvm.csd.sc.edu
Mary Barton	429-8728 x33	
Jim Edwards	7-6864	
Continuing Education:		
Mike Schoen	777-8155	mikes@rece.sc.edu
Buddy Dunlap	777-9356	
Sumter:		
Sal Macias	75-6341 x3256 or 55	salm@sc.edu
Maitland Rose	775-6341 x3353	
Joanne Klein	x3349	joanne.klein@sc.edu
Christine Boryckia	775-6341	cborycki@uscsu.sumter.uscsu.scarolina.edu
Susan Hendley	775-6341 (3298)	susanh@uscsu.sumter.uscsu.scarolina.edu
Stephen Anderson	775-6341 (3275)	stevea@sc.edu
Hemant Kher	775-3219	hemantk@sc.edu
Carolyn West	775-6341(3225)	carolynw@sc.edu
Salkehatchie:		
Wayne Chilcote	(803)549-6314 (W'boro) 1-800-922-5500(A'dale)	

Bette Levine (A)1-800-922-5500
(W)549-6314

Larry West (A)1-800-922-5500
(W)549-6314

larryw@sc.edu

Jeff Strong (A)1-800-922-5500
(W)549-6314

Tye Johnson 259-0222 (H)
Dan Ruff 584-3446 (W)

tyej@col.com

256-0766 (H)
Carl Clayton 584-3446 (W)
632-3032 (H)

Creation of new courses
USC Sumter

The following courses are for a new set of courses emphasizing the environment from a business perspective that were created by Dr. Stephen T. Bishoff and Dr. Christine Borycki from the Sumter campus. It will consist of five courses in support of an associate degree in business and economics.

For the pilot effort, the students participating in the Cooperative Association of States for Scholarships program (CASS) will be the principle group of students involved. This arrangement coincides with a shift in the emphasis of that program toward ecological topics.

The five courses are listed below. The first will be listed under an existing Biology designation. However, RCAM designations are requested for the business courses. We presented these Courses to the faculty Organization on Friday, Aug. 25, and they were approved--19 for/2 against/3 abstained.

BIOL 220 Ecology and Waste Management (1 hr., no prereq.) (Fall 1995] Seminar series that includes lectures and field trips based on the interdependence of global ecology and the waste stream.

RCA(210 Eco-Business I. (3 bra., prereq. BIOL 220). (Spring, 1996] Developing a formal business plan for a small, ecology-based business.

RCAM 220 Eco-Business II (I hr., prereq. RCAM 210). (Summer II, 1996] Continuation of RCA(210; organization of the formal business plan. Site preparation, contracts, and advertising.

RCAM 230 Eco-Business III (2 lire., prereq. RCA(220). (Fall 1996] Continuation of RCA(220; implementation of the formal business plan. Business operation, monthly Board meetings, financial reports, usage study reports, operations reports.

RCAM 240 Eco-Business IV. (1 hr., prereq. RCAN 230). (Spring, 1997] Continuation of RCA(230; assessment of the formal business plan and its implementation. Generalization to other environmental problems.

CASS ECO-BUSINESS:

Course Plans

Fall 1995

BIOL 220 Lab Ecology and Waste Management

Seminar series that includes lectures and field trips based on the interdependence of global ecology and the waste stream.

1 credit hour 1 hour/week 16 weeks lab

Session	Activity
1	Introduction, syllabus
2	Introduction to projects, form project teams
3	Lecture: Ecological Relationships - John Logue
4	Field Trip: Swamp with John Logue
5	Lecture: Ecology and the Waste Stream - Laidlaw representative
6	Field Trip: Laidlaw
7	Library trip - Columbia
8	Lecture: The Landfill Challenge - Municipal representative
9	Field Trip. Municipal and/or recycling center
10	Lecture: Recycling Waste Columbia Zoo representative
11	Field Trip: Columbia Zoo
12	Progress check on projects - process, progress, draft
13	Project time
14	Library trip - Columbia
15	Evaluation of project results
16	Evaluation of project results

Spring 1996

RCAM 210 Eco-Business I

Application course in which a small, ecology-based business is planned. By the end of the term, the class will have a formal business plan for the organizational structure, the equipment, the characterization of the market, marketing plan, and financing for the business.

3 credit hours 3 hours/week 16 weeks 3 days/week

<u>Week</u>	<u>Activity</u>
1	Introduction to the course Lecture: Small Business Planning - Vern Disney
2	Lecture: Small Business Planning - Vern Disney Lecture/Demonstration: Applying for a Position* Lecture: Organizational Structure - Chris Borycki Lecture: Accounting for a Small Business - Jean Hatcher
3	Exercise: PERT Chart development - Hemant Kher
4	Interview candidates for company officers Midterm examination on lecture and exercise material
5	Assign tasks Task group meetings
6	Lecture; Legal aspects of a small eco-business Task group meetings
7	Develop Master Plan - draft
8	Develop Master Plan continued
9	Task group reassessment; assign additional research in needed areas
10	Refine Master Plan
11	Lecture: How to secure financing for a small business - NCNB representative
12	TBA
13	TBA
14	TBA
15-16	Student presentations of task group summary papers

Note: Executive Board meetings will be held weekly. Task groups will report to the board at these meetings.

* Applying for positions as company officers will entail:

1. Submission of resumes
2. Interviewing for the position before the class (other candidates for the same position will not be allowed to observe). The interviews will be two part: structured questions from the professors and unstructured questions from the class.

Quizzes and examinations: There will be 20 point quizzes on units of lecture and exercise material and a comprehensive midterm exam.

Summer II 1996

RCAM 220 Eco-Business II

The plan created in Eco-Business I will be implemented. All site preparation and contracts will be made. Advertising will target a launch date at the beginning of the Fall semester.

1 credit hour 3 hours/week lab

Week	<u>Activity</u>
1	Introduction Lecture: Compost - Steve Bishoff Lecture: Research and Development on composting and related processes
2	Lecture: Marketing a small business - Chris Borycki Develop a PERT chart for implementation of the Master Plan
3-5	Implement the Master Plan (preparation and construction of facilities, advertise, acquire machinery, secure contracts, etc.)

Notes: Executive Board meetings will be held weekly. Task groups will report to the board at these meetings.

Fall 1996

RCAM 230 Eco-Business III

The business will operate on the planned schedule throughout the semester. Monthly Board meetings will be held to adjust plans as needed for the continuous improvement of the business. At a minimum, the following reports will be made at these meetings: financial reports, usage study reports, and operations reports. Other Board meetings will be held as needed.

2 credit 6 hours/week

Spring 1997

RCAM 240 Eco-Business IV

The project students will present a summary report to the USC Sumter community on their ecologically based business. They will cover the creation and running of the business and critique the experience including suggested improvements and future plans. It is proposed that this will be part of International Week. Additional guests may be invited such as the CASS administrators in Georgetown and interested parties from USC Columbia.

1 credit 3 hours/week

USC Times 8/24/95

Sumter campus launches Eco-Business Program

USC Sumter is launching an Eco-Business Program that will promote environmental awareness and responsibility in economically emerging countries in the Western Hemisphere.

The two-year pilot effort will target 16 Caribbean and Central American students attending the Sumter campus through the federally funded Cooperative Association of States for Scholarships (CASS) program. The pilot project will be an integral part of an associate degree with a new area of emphasis in Science and Environmental Management. Upon earning their degrees, the CASS students will return to their home countries to put what they have learned into practice.

"The Eco-Business Program will include five required courses that will support the associate degree," said Stephen T. Bishoff, an assistant professor of biology and co

director of the program. "In their first semester, CASS students will compare ecological problems of local businesses and communities with those in their own countries."

Co-directing the program with Bishoff is Christine Borycki, an assistant professor of management; both will provide primary expertise in their respective disciplines. In addition to the academic contributions of other USC Sumter faculty, representatives of

Sumter area businesses, agencies, and organizations will be invited to lecture and illustrate the practical applications of environmental

management.

"In subsequent semesters, the students will plan, implement, and assess the effectiveness of an environmentally friendly yard waste recycling business," Borycki said. "Finally, they will identify ecological problems in their home countries and design plans to resolve those problems."

The student-operated business will provide chipping and

shredding services to interested home and small business owners in the Sumter area who want to convert yard waste (lawn clippings, leaves, and small

branches) into soil-restoring mulch. This business will reduce the overuse of landfills, while turning readily accessible resources into capital gain, Borycki said. The students also will do research into developing composting for future business expansion.

This is the first interdisciplinary program between USC Sumter's Division of Science, Mathematics, and Engineering and its Division of Business and Economics. The project also represents the first attempt to have USC Sumter students operate a real business under the auspices of the University.

If the pilot program is successful, the complexity of the business operation and the size of the target student population might be broadened in successive semesters.

Bishoff

Borycki

AGENDA

Jule

- I. Call to Order
- II. Correction/Approval of Minutes April 16, 1995 USC
Beaufort
 - Reports from University Officers
 - A. Dr. John J. Duffy, Vice Provost
 - B. Professor John N. Gardner, Assoc. Vice Provost
 - C. Deans of the Campuses
- IV. Reports of the Standing Committees
 - A. Rights and Responsibilities - Prof. Danny Faulkner
 - B. Welfare - Prof. Kwame Dawes
 - C. System Affairs - Prof. Ellen Chamberlain
- V. Executive Committee - Prof. Jane Upshaw
 - Reports from Special Committees
 - A. University Library Committee
Professor Bruce Nims
 - B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses
Professor Robert Castleberry
 - C. University Committee on Faculty Welfare
Professor Roy Darby
 - D. Faculty / Board of Trustees Liaison Committee
Professor Carolyn West
 - E. Research and Scholarly Productivity
Professor Tye Johnson
 - F. Savannah River Site Committee
Professor Dan Ruff
 - 0. Insurance and Annuities -
Professor Jerry Dockery H.
 - Other Committees
 - Outside Professional Activities Committee
Professor Tandy Willis
 - Ad Hoc Committee - Professor John Catalano
- VII. Unfinished Business
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Announcements
- X. Adjournment

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
USC COLUMBIA
Daniel Management Center

Friday, September 8, 1995

Coffee -----	9:30-10:00 AM
Board Room I	
Morning session -----	10:00- AM
Room 856	
Welcome	
President Palms	
Provost Moeser	
Standing Committees -----	-12:30 PM
Rights and Responsibilities --- Room 853	
Welfare -----Room K	
Systems Affairs -----Lumkin Room	
Executive Committee -----	-12:30 PM
Room 856	
Campus Deans -----	-12:30 PM
Room H	
Lunch -----	12:30-1:45 PM
Afternoon Session -----	1:45-4:00 PM

