



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Office of the Secretary

April 24, 1987

Dr. David H. Rembert, Jr.
 Chairman, Faculty Senate
 Faculty House
 Campus

RE: Annual Report of Academic
 Planning Committee

Dear David:

The Academic Planning Committee met monthly throughout the academic year. At the initial meeting the chairman requested members to poll their colleagues and identify areas of concern which might be appropriate for the committee to address.

Coordination of curricula and admission requirements within the system were defined as areas of concern. Dr. John Gardner and Dr. John Duffy were most helpful in reviewing the development of the system. In response to the committee's request, Dr. Gardner provided a detailed review (attached) of the status of actions taken or not taken based upon the System Review Panel, 1981-1982. After much discussion during the course of several meetings, the committee recommends that:

1. the appropriate University officer collate and define residency requirements for all degrees on all campuses - the aim of such a compilation being to focus attention upon potentially divergent policies;

2. the committee endorse and support in any way practical annual meetings among system-wide discipline faculties, for the purpose of promoting coordination of degree and course offerings;

3. that the committee explore the desirability of a trimester calendar in recognition that many of the historical reasons for the semester calendar are no longer valid.

Dr. David H. Rembert, Jr.
April 24, 1987
Page Two

4. the committee observe that the teaching of upper level and graduate courses throughout the system is an area of concern. Problems associated with this aspect of the University might appropriately form the initial 1987-1988 Academic Planning agenda. To this end, Kendrick A. Clements, History, U.S.C. Columbia, has summarized issues discussed (attached).

Respectfully submitted,

John Bryan, pap

John Bryan, Chairman
Academic Planning Committee

JB/pap

Attachments



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208


OFFICE OF THE SYSTEM VICE PRESIDENT
for University Campuses and
Continuing Education

February 6, 1987

(803) 777-7695

MEMORANDUM

TO: Professor John Bryan, Chairman
Academic Planning Committee

FROM: John N. Gardner, Associate Vice President 

SUBJECT: Status of Actions Taken or Not Taken on Recommendations
of the System Review Panel 1981-1982 Academic Year

At the last meeting of the Academic Planning Committee on January 20, you requested this Office to report back to the Committee at its February 17 meeting as to what action or actions had been taken/not taken with respect to the recommendations that were made in a study then of the University System some five years by the President's System Review Panel. Vice President Duffy, and Assistant Provost Michael Welsh, and I have discussed this and report to you our following conclusions about this matter. I list below the recommendations, verbatim, and then immediately below each one, our understanding of what has transpired with respect to each recommendation.

Page 15

1. Each of the Four-Year Campuses retain the right to design specific degree programs to meet the needs of local students.
Accomplished.
2. President Holderman appoint a representative study group to examine the growth of the Two-Year Campuses and make recommendations on possible new names for these campuses which will better represent their current mission.

This was accomplished in spring of 1984 by action of the University Campuses Faculty Senate routed through the Office of the System Vice President to the President to the University Board of Trustees. Name changed to University Campuses.

MEMORANDUM

Professor John Bryan

February 6, 1987

Page 2

3. The campuses retain their current autonomy in providing such student services as counseling, scheduling, admission, and student affairs.

The Campuses still have autonomy in these areas.

Page 21

1. Each campus retain current authority to control its own admission policies as a means of achieving diversity in student bodies while at the same time ensuring prospective service to the public by upholding the quality of its graduating class.

We believe this deserves further consideration.

2. A committee of admission officers from within the System be appointed by the President to ensure that admission procedures remain compatible throughout the System.

There is no regular meeting of this group and no such committee has been established. It is our belief that there is some competition between these respective offices for the available pool of students.

3. Consultation be encouraged among all campuses prior to change in admission policy at any one campus since such change may well impact on enrollment at the other campuses.

Not done.

Page 25

1. Students in good academic standing who have completed a specific amount of coursework to be determined in concert by the faculties of the System and have maintained a grade point ratio of 2.0 or better be allowed to move freely from campus to campus.

The status of this matter seems to be quite satisfactory to the University Campuses students who enjoy free movement provided they meet the requirements of the school or college which they may wish to enter; this Office, however, cannot speak for the freedom of movement status for other students within the University System; we simply don't know.

MEMORANDUM

Professor John Bryan

February 6, 1987

Page 3

Page 26

2. Students who have completed less than the specified amount of coursework also be allowed to move, subject to the admission policies of the campus where they seek to enroll.

This has not been put in place.

3. Students must still meet the specific requirements of the professional school or discipline to which they apply for graduation.

This has always been this way.

4. The same rules governing any discipline be applied to a student coming from another campus as apply to students originating their program on that campus.

This has not been done.

Page 40

1. The process by which the special course needs of the Two-Year Campuses can be presented for consideration be clarified.

There is a mechanism for meeting the special course needs of the University Campuses but it has not been widely exercised or publicized.

2. Minimum class size be based on the individual campus's mission and unique situation.

We have no knowledge of this matter and, therefore, do not believe it to be a problem.

3. Each campus continue to be afforded the maximum degree of flexibility in developing a curriculum tailored to its specific needs.

Four Four-Year Campuses have this and the University Campuses do only to the extent that Columbia does because our curriculum is inextricably tied to that of Columbia.

MEMORANDUM

Professor John Bryan

February 6, 1987

Page 4

4. A comprehensive review be conducted as to the effect of professional accreditation on the transferability of courses and the type programs offered throughout the System.

Not done.

5. Every effort be made to establish as much commonality as possible among degree programs, where the commonality is both functional and has the approval of the different campuses.

Not done.

6. A copy of all proposed course/degree changes be sent to the appropriate person at the departmental or unit level stages of discussion.

Not done throughout the System. However, the Columbia Campus Committee on Curricula and Courses requires on its form that such coordination be done. There is some effort made by some departments to inform University Campuses in advance of proposed changes, but this is done informally and not uniformly.

7. A study be made to determine a more standardized course designations and numbering system that will afford sufficient flexibility for each campus to meet its individual needs.

Not done.

Page 41

8. //Representatives from the various disciplines on all campuses meet annually to discuss issues pertaining to their academic program.//

Some disciplines do meet annually such as chemistry, history, psychology, English, biology, occasionally foreign language, occasionally philosophy. Based on our experience this is a highly effective mechanism and process for enhancing System faculty communication and understanding and we strongly recommend the Academic Planning Committee to endorse this concept.

MEMORANDUM

Professor John Bryan

February 6, 1987

Page 5

9. A special committee be formed to study the need for the admission of "other than normally qualified students" and to establish general guidelines on the admission, progression, transfer and degree requirements for "provisional status" students.

Not done. However, the Columbia Faculty Senate has addressed considerable attention to the Provisional Year Program in the College of Applied Professional Sciences for such students at USC-Columbia.

10. Every effort be made to continue to offer developmental courses on all campuses in the System.

Done on all but Columbia.

11. Consideration be given to standardizing "in residence" in the System so that students can take their last 30 hours at any school in the System with the condition that these hours are approved by the degree-granting institution.

This has not only not been done, the University has moved in the opposite direction. A number of Columbia Colleges programs and the Four-Year Campuses have established very rigid last 30 hours residency requirements.

Page 45

1. A major effort be made to "educate" members of the System concerning the "System" concept and the need to communicate System decisions throughout the System.

Done. Examples: System committee meetings, meetings of various types of System administrators, University 101 Faculty Training Workshops, System New Faculty Executive Staff Workshops, Faculty Exchange Program, University Campuses Faculty Senate meetings, and University Campuses bus tours sponsored by this Office, plus System social activities like USC-Salkehatchie Dove Shoot and System Commencements.

2. Conference by Department and/or discipline be scheduled on a regularly occurring basis.

As indicated above, some departments do, some don't.

MEMORANDUM

Professor John Bryan

February 6, 1987

Page 6

Page 46

3. More sharing of information along horizontal lines occur. Minutes of all System committees, academic departments, etc., need to be shared on a horizontal basis.

Some department/units do this, others don't.

4. A System Policy Manual be developed which clearly differentiates between uniform policies and those that vary among the campuses.

There is a committee working on this, actively. Vice President Duffy is a member of this committee.

5. System news be distributed throughout the System via the System publication Times Nine. There is a need to redefine the purpose and audience of Times Nine.

Done.

6. The possibility be explored of setting aside one day each semester on the academic calendar for System meetings of academic departments.

Not done.

7. Policy decisions and changes, calendars of events, etc., be funneled into a "communications center" for compilation and distribution. (Example: Use System computers or television to transmit calendar of events or other data on a weekly, scheduled basis.)

Not done as specified but most of this information is readily available.

Page 51

1. A department level directory of faculty and staff be compiled and made available to each department chairman, division head, dean, and so forth.

Not done.

MEMORANDUM

Professor John Bryan

February 6, 1987

Page 7

Page 52

2. All administrators and especially department chairmen work to revitalize faculty, to inspire, encourage, and reward intellectual growth.

A great idea. We hope it is being done.

3. The following possibilities for faculty development at the System level be explored: alternative scheduling, alternative forms of payment, retraining of faculty, research leaves to fulfill institutional needs and an awareness of the faculty as potential members of the continuing education population.

Not done.

4. The System set up its own institute for training faculty members for administrative positions.

Not done.

Page 60

1. The term "Graduate Regional Studies" be dropped as well as the concept of these courses as extension or outreach programs.

Not done.

2. The term "System Graduate Study" be adopted to indicate our willingness to respond to the educational needs of the entire state.

Not done.

3. The Graduate School, under the direction of the Dean and the Provost, expand the two proposed policies and criteria on System Graduate Faculties to include other appropriate disciplines.

This is being worked on.

Page 67

1. Broader use be made of instructional technology as a means of delivering courses to different locations.

This, definitely, is being done by the Division of Continuing Education's Office of Telecommunications Instruction and Correspondence Study.

MEMORANDUM

Professor John Bryan

February 6, 1987

Page 8

2. The existing telecourses structure be strengthened to ensure that: a) faculty from all campuses are involved in the production of appropriate materials, and b) courses are produced which reflect the needs of the various campuses.

This needs to be looked at, in our opinion, but is not currently being done.

3. Faculty have the opportunity to become literate in the utilization of computer technology for instruction as well as research and that the University develop a resource capability in computer assisted instruction.

Being done via assistance of Computer Services Division workshops, Faculty Exchange Program/Computer Science Institute, etc.

Page 75

1. A redefinition of the relationship between System administrators and Chancellors be explored in such a manner as to ensure a constructive balance among lines of authority as the final goal.

This is an ongoing matter.

2. The range of authority of the Academic Forward Planning Committee be reexamined and clarified to provide for faculty participation at the System level.

We suggest that this recommendation be reexamined by the Academic Planning Committee.

Page 81

1. The unified budgetary strategy for the System be continued in view of its recent successes.

Done.

2. The administration broadly disseminate to faculty institutional budgetary information that will enable them to understand the impact of both inflation and the funding procedures for mandated raises, as well as the loss of real purchasing power upon the University's budget.

Done.



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29208

FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Office of the Secretary

March 17, 1987

TO: John Bryan, Chairman
Academic Planning Committee

FROM: Kendrick A. Clements

RE: Graduate Programs within the University System

1. The issue, as raised in the committee meeting today, seems to fall into two parts: the question of graduate faculty status for faculty members on the various campuses other than Columbia; and the future of graduate courses and programs on the various university campuses. The first of these problems seems to become readily soluble if the second were satisfactorily addressed.

2. Simply put, the issue seems to be that the various university campuses aspire to offer more graduate courses and programs, while the faculty of the Columbia campus have serious reservations about the desirability of that.

3. The desire on the part of the various campuses to offer graduate programs is a normal result of growth and development, reflecting better-qualified faculties, student and community demand, and natural ambition for development.

4. On the other hand, there are sound reasons for the Columbia faculty's resistance to such growth. In part, they are concerned that students and resources will be diverted from programs on the Columbia campus that are not adequately supported even now. In part, they are concerned that facilities for graduate instruction do not exist or are inadequate on other campuses (e.g., laboratories, equipment, library resources, etc.).

5. Since graduate education is the most expensive part of the university's educational mission, it is imperative that the institution have and abide by a rational plan in regard to its future growth and development. To that end, the Academic Planning Committee might find it desirable to explore some aspects of the issue. Among the

Dr. John Bryan
March 17, 1987
Page Two

agencies and individuals it might usefully consult are: the Graduate Council, the Graduate School Dean, the Graduate Regional Studies office, the administrators of the university campuses, the Division of University Campuses, the Provost's office, the deans of various colleges and schools, the Commission on Higher Education, and the faculties of various schools or departments, among others.

6. Inasmuch as resources in this state are finite, the committee must consider the possibility that NO graduate programs should develop on the various campuses, and that any now existing should be eliminated. But it is probably more politically and educationally realistic to seek a plan for restricted and controlled growth. Unless such a plan is imposed from above, however, it will be unworkable unless it rests upon a system-wide consensus. Whether such a consensus is achievable is impossible to say at this point, but it would seem logical to suggest that the committee take as its first task trying to find out whether any consensus is possible, and only then the development of a specific plan. Unless there is agreement on the basic premise of limited and controlled growth, nothing else is possible.