



CHE  
10/04/2007  
Agenda Item 4.02G

## South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

*Att. VII*  
Layton McCurdy, M.D., Chairman  
Mr. Daniel Ravenel, Vice Chairman  
Col. John T. Bowden, Jr.  
Douglas R. Forbes, D.M.D.  
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne  
Dr. Raghu Korrapati  
Dr. Louis B. Lynn  
Ms. Cynthia C. Mosteller  
Mr. James R. Sanders  
Mr. Hood Temple  
Mr. Randy Thomas  
Mr. Neal J. Workman, Jr.  
Dr. Mitchell Zais

Dr. Garrison Walters, Executive Director

October 4, 2007

### MEMORANDUM

**To:** Dr. Layton R. McCurdy, Chairman, and Members, Commission on Higher Education

**From:** Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Chair, and Members, Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing *B. Horne*

### Consideration of Annual Report on Compliance with the English Fluency Act in Higher Education, FY 2006-2007

#### Background

In 1991 the General Assembly passed the English Fluency in Higher Education Act (SECTION 59-103-160 of the SC code of Laws of 1976, as amended). This Act required each public higher education institution to submit to the Commission a compliance plan developed to meet the requirement that the institution ensures that its faculty members can communicate effectively even when English is not their first language.

In the language of the Act in Section (C)(2) each institution was required to submit as part of its compliance plan an assurance that an adequate procedure exists for students to report grievances concerning the inability of instructors to be understood in their spoken or written English. In Section (D)(2), the Act further requires that each institution must report annually the number of grievances filed by students under the provisions of (C)(2) and the disposition of those grievances.

On November 3, 1994, the Commission on Higher Education required that each institution of public higher education in South Carolina publish a clear, complete summary of the institution's policy on English Fluency in Higher Education *either in both the catalog and student handbook or in the Academic*

Section and the Student Affairs Section (for institutions with a unified publication) of the unified publication on campus policies.

At its meeting on November 2, 1995, the Commission further required that all institutions must demonstrate each reporting year (i.e., in this case, the period beginning July 1, 2006, and ending with the conclusion of the Spring Semester 2007) that they are fully in compliance with the requirements regarding publication of the law's provisions in the Catalog and Student Handbook.

In order to assess the institutions' on-going compliance with this Act and to ensure that there is an annual accounting of any grievances covered by the Act, Commission staff conducts an annual survey of the institutions' compliance, policies, and grievances.

### **Discussion**

All institutions of public higher education had submitted their reports to the Commission on Higher Education by July 6, 2007, for the recently completed academic year of 2006-2007. The data submitted in those reports show that all of the State's 33 public institutions are fully in compliance with the publication of the required student information under the law and Commission policy.

In the report for the 2005-2006 academic year, one institution reported that it was out of compliance with the Commission's publication requirement stated above. That institution reported in the current survey that it has revised its materials and is in compliance.

Since the passage of the English Fluency Act in Higher Education by the General Assembly in 1991, the Commission has issued fifteen annual reports (including the current one) to the chairmen of the committees in the House and Senate with jurisdiction in educational matters. In all the previous fourteen reports a total of six student complaints had been documented. In the current year's reports from the institutions no student grievance was reported at any of the thirty-three public institutions.

The minimal use of the grievance policy by students throughout the state suggests that public institutions of higher education have been highly successful in the hiring and retention of faculty who are capable of communicating well in the English language for purposes of teaching and advising students. In summary, students appear to be satisfied in all public institutions with the level of communication they are receiving from instructors whose first language is not English. For the past academic year, faculty members whose first language is not

English are apparently meeting the expectations of the General Assembly for their ability to communicate effectively with students.

**Recommendation**

The Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing commends favorably to the Commission for approval and transmittal to the appropriate chairpersons of the education committees of the General Assembly.