The meeting was called to order by Chairman Rufus G. Fellers at 3:01 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes.

The minutes of 30 November and 7 December 1988 were approved as distributed.

II. Reports of Officers.

Officers' reports were suspended at this time so that Mr. Commissioner Fred Sheheen of the Commission on Higher Education, an invited guest, could address the Faculty Senate. [Note: The following remarks are complete but lightly edited.]

Commissioner Sheheen:

"Thank you very much, Dr. Fellers. And I am pleased to be with you today. I must say I am probably more pleased to be here today then if I were here in December. It appears that all of our collective calm is in considerably better shape today than it was in December and for that I am grateful. I have brought with me Alan Krech, Associate Commissioner for Planning and Special Projects and Robert Poch who is a coordinator and who works with Alan for the purpose of answering any questions that might come up in a technical way with respect to the commission's program for planning and assessment which is the subject that I plan to address today. I believe you all sent us a resolution regarding the process and content of the planning and institutional effectiveness guidelines. I should tell you that the commission in December adopted those guidelines in principle and left them open at the request of the University and the institutions of higher learning in the state for a period of 60 days for comment. During that period of time the University of South Carolina and a number of other institutions but principally the university submitted changes, deletions, alterations and additions to both the Planning Perspectus and the Guidelines for Institutional Effectiveness. Those were considered by the Advisory Committee on Planning which is made up of all the institutions of higher learning in the state. We painstakingly went through all of those regulations and guidelines and made a number of changes consistent with the suggestions made by the institutions and
including many of those that were suggested by the university. Basically some of the formats were changed, and one important date was changed. That is the date that the state plan was to be completed and a substitute mechanism provided for the Commission to proceed in planning work in the absence of our ability to get that plan out in the period of time we had projected.

I believe after that committee completed its work and it is essentially an institutional advisory committee, the Planning and Assessment Committee met in the Commission Office and heard from all of the institutions again. They went through both The Institutional Effectiveness Guidelines and The Planning Perspectus and made some additional changes some again at the suggestion of the institutions and some at the suggestion of the members of the committee who are members of the Commission on Higher Education. Your principle representative in all of that, by designation I presume of the President, was the Provost of the University, Art Smith Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. I would say there were three problems when we left that meeting and they were assigned to be resolved by subcommittees and those problems have been resolved. The final product, which will be before the Commission tomorrow at 10:30 a.m., I believe has the agreement of the colleges and universities - Art is here and he can speak for the University of South Carolina. I think we have satisfactorily resolved the concerns of the colleges and universities with respect to The Guidelines of Institutional Effectiveness.

Now I know that the faculty people, and this is the second faculty that I have met with since this process started, are concerned about intrusion, about the change in the powers that the Commission may be exercising, about extra work that you will have to do in the assessment process, about why the Commission on Higher Education in the state of South Carolina really requires additional effectiveness reporting when the Southern Association has really required effectiveness reporting as a part of the accreditation process. I want to answer some of those questions for you today as best I can and then respond to your questions.

First of all, Act 629 of the General Assembly more popularly known as "The Cutting Edge", allocated to the institutions of higher learning in the state a significant amount of money to fund endowed professorships, merit scholarships for the young people in the state, faculty grants for improvement of instructional programs, and research money. The University of South Carolina was certainly one of the very large beneficiaries of the research allocation and a number of other financial improvements in higher education in the state and those programs will continue and they are recommended for funding again in all versions of the appropriations bill that have emerged from the Governor's office and the Budget and Control Board today. In return for that or along with that, the Commission and the institutions agreed to some new accountability and assessment and reporting requirements.
We are not alone in the shift. There are 31 states in the country that have newly launched assessment activities underway so we are one among 31 in higher education that have new initiatives and assessment activities underway. In 19 of those states the activities are administered by the coordinating boards. We are a coordinating agency not a governing agency. There is a question as to whether the real relationship between the colleges and universities and the commission was altered with the passage of Act 629. In my view it was altered really in only one way. The program approval authority that we had is entirely the same that we had before. The facilities approval authority is precisely the same that we have all lived with for decades. The budgetary exercise that we have in making recommendations to the General Assembly is precisely the same. The law does say that the guidelines for institutional effectiveness shall be formulated in accordance with the institution's effectiveness plans and shall be formulated in accordance with rules, procedures, and requirements formulated by the Commission on Higher Education. Now that isn't really a change in the relationship of the commission and the institutions because we have never had effectiveness plans before. We have never had institutional assessment before. What it did in setting up those institutional effectiveness plans was to give the Commission on Higher Education a role to play. The law also says that the results of the institutional effectiveness plans will be distributed to the interested constituents of higher education in the state so what you have is a new area of activity. It doesn't change any old relationships that existed with the Commission on Higher Education. It does set up a new area of activity. It doesn't change any old relationship. I would also like to say The Institutional Effectiveness Guidelines are reporting requirements. They say we would like to have this information and that information and this information and that information. They do not say that if this happens you have got to do that. So they are simply reporting requirements - informational reporting requirements.

I know that some of you will sit out there and say 'yes we know at the front end that it doesn't say you are going to change but what are you going to do 5 or 10 years down the road'? Well I don't know - 5 years down the road I will let somebody else worry about it. But you can be sure that if there were any proposals that were to emanate from The Institutional Effectiveness Guidelines that they would go through the normal deliberative processes that take place but the guidelines as enacted by the Commission called for no action as a result of any of the information that is solicited. I think that is very important for you to understand. We believe that the formulation of the information by the institutions and the presentation of the information will have a salutary effect on higher education in the state. Let us just take one area not applicable to your institution. If the drop out rate or the retention rate is 40% or 41% in an institution, and it is certainly not this one, then you have to report that annually to the public and the General Assembly and the
commission. It isn't likely that you are just going to ignore the fact that you are only retaining 40% of the students from the freshmen to senior year. You are going to be concerned about it and you are going to work on it. And we believe that all of this will be healthy and beneficial to higher education.

We have a pattern to go by - the Education Improvement Act - this is far more severe than the accountability measures in the institutional effectiveness plans in higher education. Those of you who either have children in school or who have friends who are teachers or who are in the Department of Education know that the accountability measures in Education Improvement Act are very strictly geared to testing at various states - the CTBS, BSAP. Some financial awards for the schools and the school districts are based on test scores. There is none of that in the Institutional Effectiveness Plans for higher education institutions. We have specifically avoided that in drafting the plans although we want to know how well students are doing, we don't have any of those very strict numerical measures that are applied to the elementary and secondary system in the Education Improvement Act.

One other thing I would like to say before we open the floor for discussion and that is the advent of The Institutional Effectiveness Guidelines. I won't talk too much about The Planning Perspectives because that isn't really as much at issue as we have made some adjustment in time frame. We think when the institutions of higher learning in this state give the results in 18 specific categories and that of operation there are going to be major threads that emerge that transcend the system. When all of the institutions, and we have 33 public institutions in this state, pinpoint in their institutional effectiveness plans a glaring need - financial, facilities, or programmatic - it is going to make higher education in South Carolina much more persuasive with the General Assembly in terms of getting the money that we need in order to have a well financed system of higher education. In order to pay the faculty salaries that we need to keep those who are here happy, and to attract quality new faculty we need that kind of powerful argument when we go to the General Assembly. I am not going to say there are not going to be some minuses because we are not going to look as good as we ought to look in every category. But when those major threads emerge - faculty salaries, library inadequacies, scientific equipment inadequacies - they will be noted. These are the things that I know about because I did a little ad-hoc survey a year ago on the major needs of the institutions and the common threads are remarkable. In fact, when we got into the Ways and Means Committee last year and they asked us what ills would be cured with an increase in formula funding, fortunately I had this survey and it was very persuasive because it was an independent survey. Each institution came up with almost the same things - faculty salaries,
library inadequacies, equipment inadequacies. It helped in getting formula funding raised from 88% to 93.5% last year. I think we are going to see that kind of information emerge from these effectiveness plans. We don't think effectiveness plans going to say that people are doing a lousy job. We think effectiveness planning is going to say we need this. This inadequacy is caused by this and from that we will have cogent and logical arguments to present to the General Assembly to get the kind of support we need for higher education in the state. I am dedicated to that.

I think perhaps in the early instances we didn't really talk enough about that part of what we could realize from The Institutional Effectiveness Plans but I think that is going to be a real benefit. We are searching for ways of improving higher education in the state. That is very simple. Those methodologies include looking very carefully at what we are doing, drawing from the facts that we elicit from the needs of the system. Then articulating those needs with the Council of College Presidents and the institutions individually to the General Assembly. I personally believe we are going to have a much stronger program to sell. We are going to have much more crediblity and that is going to result in better financing and better support for higher education in the state. I hope in your minds that puts a bit of a different light on what we are trying to do, and I think it is constructive rather than destructive, and I think that it will help us all. Having said that I will be pleased to answer questions."

Fellers opened the floor for questions to Commissioner Sheheen. [Note: Some 25 typescript pages ensued. Mr. Sheheen and Mr. Krech responded to questions involving word meanings in the two commission documents. Mr. Sheheen explained the current work at the commission and how it operates. The original typescript is on file in the Faculty Senate Office.]

III. Reports of Officers.

President James B. Holderman noted that the commission had agreed to two time changes - the 60 day delay in acting on the planning assumptions and the completion of the state plan from fall of 1989 to fall of 1990.

He then reported on the status of the budget. Current thought is at 93-94 percent of formula funding. Mr. Sheheen is talking about 95-96 percent at the end of the process. We are working hard to obtain full formula funding. We are also working hard to obtain an 8 percent increase in salary average done on a merit basis from now on as a given in the budgetary process. The Board of Trustees has unanimously endorsed this as a major priority. The Council of Presidents adopted a resolution which said anything short of full formula funding should not include the 8 percent action. Mr. Sheheen has also asked for $14m for The Cutting Edge next year - up from $5m allocated this year.
He noted discussions were underway on a lease purchase agreement for Journalism and Mass Communications building as well as the purchase of the Gibbs property (5 acres) near the Coliseum.

Professor Herr (BIOL) asked for clarification of the Thomas Cooper Library's "fluid" condition and what can be done to prevent future like occurrences? Holderman said he had been told the problem does not lie in the original planning of the building but rather in a drainage problem which is being corrected.

Professor Conant (MUSC) asked about the status of proposed new music building.

Holderman said we had been given authorization to seek architectural bids and designs for a $12-18m music building to be built on the north end of the Koger Center block. The buildings would be connected by a tunnel. It would be at least a 4 year period before Professor Conant should pack his baton.

Professor Mack (ARTS) expressed his appreciation for the administration's wisdom in pursuing the Koger Center to its conclusion and for the Library increasing its special collections with the acquisition of the Ross Roy Burns collection. Holderman thanked Mack and said new facilities for the Art Department are on the "front burner" and has a high priority.

Professor Weasmer (GINT) asked if the additional money that may be appropriated might for "The Cutting Edge" the commission additional leverage over higher education institutions.

Holderman did not think that would be the case as the money distribution procedure is in place.

Provost Arthur K. Smith spoke to the activity within the University system that took place following the commission's granting the 60 day delay. As a result, he believes we substantially got what we were asking - a year's delay in submitting by the commission of a state-wide plan to the General Assembly. In addition, a number of wording changes, important to the University were obtained.

Professor Holst (FORL) asked if the commission was now aware of faculty interest in the commission's activities?

Smith said he believed that was demonstrated by the Commissioner's comments to Faculty Senate.

Professor Safko (ASTR) asked if the list of commission staff members with their credentials could be updated and placed in the Faculty Senate Office?

Smith said it would be done.
Professor Tucker (SOCY) said he hoped the spirit of cooperation between faculty and administration, brought about by the delay of a "short" 60 days would continue now that the emergency is over.

Smith gave his assurance that he will work with faculty committees with continued openness and cooperation.

Holderman pointed to the relationships developed with Budget, Bookstore, and Library Committees this past year.

Tucker noted "The Cutting Edge" legislation bill contained wording he had not heard or seen before he got a copy in December.

Holderman responded it had changed in interpretation somewhat than from the interpretation we had at the time it was being discussed by the General Assembly.

III. Reports of Committees.

A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Professor Silvernail, Secretary:

Silvernail announced:

1. Call for nominations for Faculty Senate Committees. Election will take place at the March meeting.

2. Material for the new Bulletin must be into Curricula and Courses Committee by 1 March.

3. Professor James Hardin has been appointed to a three year term to the Bookstore Board of Directors.

Professor Aylward (FORL) asked for a summary of nominations submitted for the Bookstore Board of Directors.

Fellers said one nomination was received aside from the appointment that was made.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Bledsoe, Chair:

Bledsoe moved the committee report. It was accepted as distributed.

Safko (ASTR) asked the committee to clarify their procedures when a student requests a grade change to a W, when the instructor does not have the option of assigning a W.
Herr (BIOL) noted the policy was established by the Faculty Senate when they passed a resolution saying that students on the grade roll, not attending class received a grade of F. The burden is on the student to prove to the Registrar that he/she did officially drop the course. If the student can do this, the Registrar contacts the instructor and informs him/her that an error was made and the student has been given a W. If not, the recorded grade stands.

C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor Kuiper, Chair:

Kuiper moved I, II, III A, B, C, with the change of ENGL 600 to LING 600. These were approved with the change. She then moved III.D. French, after explaining the reasons for the changes. These were approved. Item III.D., Spanish, was approved with one dissenting vote. Item III.E. was approved.

Item IV. was moved following the deletion by committee of JOUR 533. These were approved.

Item V., Pharmacy, was moved. Silvernail pointed out these were all number changes, and technically did not change the prerequisite numbers. Following discussion, the Faculty Senate by majority vote accepted the report and agreed to change the prerequisite numbers de facto.

Items VI and VII were approved. Experimental courses BIOL 572X (agenda) and GEOG 337X (handout) were received as information.

D. Admissions Committee, Professor Marshall, Chair:

Marshall moved the committee report with the change in the first paragraph of the proposed wording, second line from "graduating from high school after 1990" to "applying for admission in September 1990 and thereafter".

Following discussion of the committee recommendation, Professor Davis (PSYC) moved an amendment which would change the third and second sentences from the end of the recommendation to read: "All applicants should rank in the top one-half of their graduating class and should score a minimum of 1000 on the SAT or 21 on the ACT." The amendment passed.

There followed intense discussion of the amended resolution Professor Van Brunt (ENGR) moved to recommit the report to committee. Following further discussion, the motion to recommit was sustained.

IV. Report of Secretary.
None.
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V. Unfinished Business.
None.

VI. New Business.
None.

VII. Good of the Order.

Davis (PSYC) noted the joint report from Faculty Budget and Welfare Committees appears in the agenda as Attachment 4.

Fellers asked if Faculty Welfare Committee was investigating the problem of obtaining prescriptions under the medical insurance coverage at the beginning of the year.

Professor Becker, as committee chair, said the committee was not aware of that problem but was looking into the raising of premiums and why there is a supposed short-fall in the reserve account.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.