

# **FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

## **FEBRUARY 5, 1997**

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. in Gambrell Auditorium  
by Henry Price, Chair.

### **I. Approval of Minutes.**

The minutes were approved as presented with the following corrections.  
PROFESSOR SAFKO (ASTR) corrected page 2 to read "Professor Lane moved the  
deletion of ASTR 101." PROFESSOR WEASMER (GINT) corrected his statement on  
page 5 to read "That the Faculty Senate condemn action by the Residence Hall  
Association to provide bus service to the airport for students two days prior to  
Thanksgiving break and try to prevent this from occurring in the future."

### **II. Report of Officers.**

#### **A. Report of Provost Don Greiner:**

Dr. GREINER reported that Dr. Palms and the Building and Grounds Committee of  
the Board of Trustees visited the South Caroliniana Library and all were in agreement  
that something must be done.

He said that two undergraduate students could possibly be selected as Fulbright  
Scholars.

William Faulkner's "The Bear" will be used for the first-year students.

### **III. Report of Committees**

#### **A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Professor Sarah B. Wise, Secretary:**

Nominations for Faculty Senate committees will be presented at the March meeting.  
Nominations from the floor will be accepted.

#### **B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Stephen McNeill, Chair:**

Henry Price presented the report, which was approved as presented.

#### **C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor G. B. Lane, Chair:**

## **I. College of Applied Professional Sciences**

The report was approved as presented.

## **II. College of Liberal Arts**

The report was approved as presented.

## **III. College of Nursing**

The report was approved as presented.

## **IV. College of Pharmacy**

Professor Lane said that the terms "from" and "to" should be deleted because two courses were involved. At the end of the course description for DPHR 610 "pass/fail" should be added. The report was approved.

## **V. College of Science and Mathematics**

The report was approved as presented.

## **VI. Professor Lane asked Richard Bayer (Registrar) to address some issues concerning May Session.**

The following report was presented:

RICHARD BAYER, REGISTRAR:

Professor Lane asked me to speak on just a few things. Let me mention 3 or 4 items, and I will be as brief as possible. One was the suffix indicator. In November, the Faculty Senate passed the recommendation of Standards and Petitions about a course designator to be on May Session courses so they could easily identify these courses. That presented somewhat of a challenge to us in the Registrar's Office. We put our heads together and decided that at that particular time in November we didn't have a lot of time to do a whole lot of things so we decided to come up with the reserve. I use the word reserve to be the suffix of "M" to suggest May Session. So you will see after all the courses the "M" suffix, which denotes May Session. Again we thought that was the best way we could come up with a course designator. The other thing that Standards and Petitions requested was that we put May Session in a particular term or session. That was another issue that we looked at very carefully. Many constituents at the table had their ideas as to whether it should be a term? Should it be a session? For a variety of reasons we decided that a session at this point in time would be the easiest way to handle May Session. So it is a session that is designated as 555, which is unique. So May Session is a session within the Summer I term. It has a course

designator of M, and it has a session designator 555. There are still some problems, but I think we can iron them out and move on.

Professor Lane indicated to me that because of the focus and attention that he put on May Session, there was a backlog of regular courses that you have not had an opportunity to look at for Summer I, Summer II, and Fall. My office, in working with other folks, decided we would ask Professor Lane to give us as many courses as possible from those his committee is looking at. We would enter them into the course catalog and into the schedule of classes with the parenthetical statement: "Courses offered pending Faculty Senate or Graduate Council approvals." We would make sure that no one registered for those courses unless the courses were approved by Faculty Senate and/or Graduate Council.

The other thing Professor Lane asked me to do was to perhaps review the guidelines that are out on May Session. As you know Curricula and Courses passed some guidelines and the Registrar's Office submitted some guidelines to those departments that submit the schedule of courses. Still, frankly, I think there are some gray areas. What I would suggest is that we have a debriefing after May Session. Sometime in the summer, we will bring people from Curricula and Courses, Scholastic Standards and Petitions, faculty, and other administrative types who manage May Session to sit down and see if we can tighten up our rules and procedures and work at those gray issues and gray areas.

And the last thing I want to say is that we are really looking forward to launching another May Session. We believe it is going to be successful. We will be coming out with some nice promotional marketing pieces. This time what we plan to do is to use May Session as an entree to Summer I/Summer II, the Summer of Carolina, because we do want to promote Summer I and Summer II. We are cognizant that May Session last year may have taken away some students who typically would have fallen into Summer I/Summer II. So we are going to do our best to promote that -- not only some of the exciting courses that I see here on the handout, but summer as well. And, I think I will leave it at that unless you have questions for me.

ROY SCHWARTZMAN (THSP) suggested Christmas break was not an ideal time to announce May Session proposal deadlines.

RICHARD BAYER (REGISTRAR) agreed with Professor Schwartzman. He said that the late deadline was due in part to the November endorsement of May Session by the Senate.

PROFESSOR LANE thanked everyone for their cooperation in the May Session approval process. The Committee decided to treat all of the May Session courses as "X" courses.

PROFESSOR STAN FRYER (BADM) said that MGMT 493 should be MGSC 493.

PROFESSOR INA RAE HARK (ENGL) asked if other courses that are versions of standing courses are going to be offered in May Session.

PROFESSOR LANE said no.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) asked about the concept for the symphony course, which is offered by his school.

PROFESSOR LANE said that there is no course in the School of Music that specializes in the symphony of the 19th century.

CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCI) said that her department sought clarification from the Committee concerning the guidelines for existing special topics courses that were intended to be offered in May Session. This department thought that these courses did not have to be sent to the committee.

PROFESSOR LANE said that special topics courses submitted for May Session were subjected to the same scrutiny as other courses.

PROFESSOR CHARLES WEASMER (GINT) asked if the courses were presented as "X" courses because the committee guidelines were not official. He also asked if the committee intended to come back for official approval of guidelines.

PROFESSOR LANE said that he hoped the committee would develop official criteria for May Session on which the Senate would vote.

PROFESSOR SCHWARTZMAN (THSP) asked if courses that are especially suitable for May Session could be approved by the Senate to be offered repeatedly in future May Sessions.

PROFESSOR LANE responded that he hoped that there would be an opportunity for courses to be designated strictly as May Session.

SAFKO (ASTR) said that SOWK 306 should be SOWK 306M.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) expressed thanks to the committee for doing a good job of getting a handle on those course that are being offered.

PROFESSOR PRICE said that the committee reports would be interrupted for Dr. Palms' report.

PRESIDENT PALMS gave the following report:

This is a good time and a bad time for the University. If you travel around the state, you hear good things about us, especially after last night. I'm getting calls from all over the country saying that I hope your academics have improved as much as your basketball. But there is also a good perception around the state. The word is out that we are increasing our admission standards and we raised the standards and the criteria for promotion and tenure. Our bond rating is up. I think that is one of the reasons why we have a bond bill. It looks like we are going to get a good portion of that bond bill to meet the needs of our master plan, particularly with the deferred maintenance and renovation that we have. So there is a good feeling out there.

We are still being underfunded by the state. We are still running behind \$1,400 to \$1,500 in state allocation per student, and I know you are struggling for new money for your programs. When you see a proposed budget initiated in the state that does not have fully funded faculty salaries, you know that we have our challenges ahead of us. The Governor has proposed a salary increase, but it is supposed to be funded internally with your own funds. That may work for some agencies, but it is certainly not going to work for the University of South Carolina.

The good news is that interest in the University is up. The applicant pool is up for next year. We already have 700 more freshmen enrolled for next year than we did last year at this time. Enrollment is extraordinarily important for us, as you know. It is also very important for us to continue to drive up the quality. The SAT score is up. The GPA of the applicants is up. The interest of better students out-of-state is up. I want to really express appreciation for how many of you are engaged in the recruiting process. We hear every day about your response to students who wonder if this is the place that they want to come, particularly with the Carolina Scholars and the potential Honors College students. For you to participate in that recruiting process is very important for us.

In the General Assembly, our very very top goal, as I said earlier, is to get faculty salaries fully funded and competitive - with the help of Dr. Eddie Floyd, our former chairman who now serves on the Commission on Higher Education and is still on our Board of Trustees. We have presented data to show how out of line the salaries are on the Columbia campus with the peer institutions that we have chosen and which have been approved by the Commission as our peer institutions for our aspirations to be a Carnegie I Research University and eventually, hopefully, a member of the AAU. And, at the full professor level we are \$6,000 or \$7,000 out of line. Clemson is also

out of line with its peer institutions, and so is MUSC. And, if you look at how much money would be necessary to close that gap, it is probably very unrealistic to assume that we are going to get that kind of money. But the case at least needs to be made that something needs to be done.

In this bond bill that has been proposed, there is \$15 million for the University of South Carolina and sufficient money for the other campuses as well. It is very important for our master plan. Then there is the remaining almost \$5 million in there to complete our science building. Last year we got \$5.4 million, I think, or \$5.6 million, and we needed the rest of the money that is in this particular budget as proposed by the Governor.

A tremendous amount of work has gone into working with the Commission as we try to define these 37 parameters that are going to be used to evaluate our performance and three years from now, it will be used principally to fund higher education. As you know, the Commission has set up three committees, one for research universities, one for four-year institutions, and one for two-year institutions that are helping define what these parameters should be and we have had a lot of help from the business leaders in this community. Larry Wilson has headed the research committee helping to define these parameters. We are very supportive of this, and we have already, as you know, taken initiatives here before this was proposed to challenge ourselves to be held accountable about what we say we are doing at this institution. You have done this yourselves by raising admission standards, by looking at the way you evaluate yourselves - peer and student evaluations in the classroom. To see how well we are doing with our graduates, we report our LSAT scores and our GRE scores. There are many parameters like that that we have already instituted. There is an increased emphasis on measuring the quality of what we are doing and we are increasingly being held responsible. Before I came to this meeting, I was with a major industry in the state who is trying to ascertain whether we are really meeting our advertised program claims. They are looking to see how they can work with you. There are new kinds of combination skills, and I know one of the colleges, the Business School, has been working with the Financial Service Business to try and put together the right combination of computer science and computer technology skills to build a curriculum to meet the needs. This particular company has 900 openings, and it cannot find qualified people coming out of this institution who have that combination of skills. These are high-paying jobs. So we are being asked to cooperate and to certify more rigorously what we are doing here. I am proud that we have taken the lead in many of these areas.

In a few weeks the publisher will finally come out with our vision statement for this institution that we were using for the bicentennial campaign. The campaign in this silent phase is going very, very well. I am very optimistic that we are going to meet

these goals. We are going to need every bit of those resources in order to raise our endowment to support our professorial endowed chairs, named professorships, etc., and scholarships for the outstanding students that we are not attracting. We are getting some major gifts, and the number of prospects that we have been able to identify is really remarkable. So I am very optimistic about that, but, again, it takes a tremendous amount of effort. It takes some money to raise money. So we have made an investment in doing that, and I am very hopeful that it is going to pay off.

I would be glad to hear your comments or answer any of your questions. There will be a letter sent out to the faculty with some other items that I don't think would be appropriate to mention at this time.

There is also on the 25th of February the beginning of Religious Emphasis Week. We are going to have a interfaith breakfast in the morning. I hope you will be able to attend because it is important for the students. With that Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to hear comments or answer any questions.

CHARLES MACK (ART) asked about the possibility of acquiring the property that is being vacated by the Columbia Museum of Art.

PRESIDENT PALMS replied:

One of the longest meetings of the trustees' Buildings and Grounds Committee was last week and probably the largest amount of approved future construction has basically been approved by the trustees. We have moved quite a bit since the master plan was officially adopted. There are new things that have happened. We have had to make adjustments in what our estimates are for the dormitories that we build after the new dormitories will be completed in the fall. We have had to do some readjusting in thinking - where we might place the fraternities. We have had communications with the community people about this, and we will probably have to relocate the fraternity area, which means we will have to acquire additional property. Last year you all wrote 1,400 proposals. We went from \$40 million in research four years ago to almost \$80 million in research. We need space for that. There are people with large grants who have no place to put their faculty or their technicians or their graduate students. So we have identified other pieces of property that we are going to have to acquire. As you know this is a very ambitious master plan program, which costs more than \$400 million. Enough changes have been suggested that we asked the planners to update the master plan in its entirety. Based upon the information that I know so far and the demands on the resources that we have, we have reached a conclusion that that particular piece of property at this time would not be the best use of our resources. We are going to wait until the master plan has been reformulated for us and until we have a better understanding of what might be appropriate this year in the bond bill. Now

that is not to say that if a real fire sale deal came along, and it was obviously a good opportunity for us, we wouldn't go ahead and do that. We are also, of course, engaged with the Lexington and Richland counties, the city, and private donors in finding a site for two major projects - one is the arena and one is a wellness center. We need both of those major facilities. Again looking for where we might place those and what land is contiguous to the campus has put some pressure on the resources that we have. So until that is settled and we have picked the site, we are in a holding position. I hear what you are saying. It has been discussed. We have had discussions with George Terry, also, but at least at this time, we have not seen it appropriate to respond to that acquisition in a positive way. Thank you very much.

**D. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Caroline Strobel, Chair: No report.**

**E. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Robert Wilcox, Chair: No report.**

**F. Admissions Committee, Professor Jim Burns, Chair:**

Prior to 1992, if a student predicted a 2.0, that student was regularly admitted to the University of South Carolina. Starting around 1992 or so, you started to voice concerns about admission standards, and you wanted to raise some of those standards; so the Admissions Committee started to look into those elements. We came to you in February 1992 and asked that we begin the process of raising admission standards. So beginning with Fall 1993 we went from a 2.0 to 2.15. Whenever you raise admission standards, of course, you know you are going to have fewer students. We predicated there would be 300 fewer students, but we only had 155 fewer students. So it was not a significant decrease in our student population. There were specific reasons for that, and we will tell you about them.

We saw the SAT average, as a result of this increase, go up 36 points. We came back to you in 1994 and asked for Fall of 1995 that we raise admission standards from 2.15 to 2.25. Again, we predicted a decrease of 200 to 300 students. We had an actually decrease of 15 students as a result of the new admission requirements. That was also offset by the fact that you okayed the provisional year to go from 250 to 350 students for 2 years in 1995 and 1996. So with that increase in admission standards, we actually had 124 more students beginning in 1995. We are certainly concerned about economic impact, and we are concerned about diversity. With these two increases, the male/female population has held steady. Since 1992 we have been at 43.8% male, 56.2% female, and 20.4% African American, which is significant.

Why has our enrollment been steady? Why has it been steady when the national trends of standard enrollments are going down? We are bucking the trends as Dr. Palms said to you last year. Although the population of 18-year olds is increasing, there are two,

maybe three, significant reasons why our enrollment has held steady with these increase in admission standards. The first one, of course, is we have gotten significant scholarship help from the administration in the last three years. Of course, there is more money for National Merit Scholars, which means that we are attracting more students on the higher end of the scale. And, I want to reiterate what Dr. Palms said, the second reason has to do with faculty support. In the last three years, faculty members have been more involved in admissions and recruiting than ever before. I want to emphasize some of the things that you have done to keep our enrollment steady. You participate in the bus tours here in the state in which we welcome newly accepted students. That is significant to students and particularly to parents. You welcome people into your classrooms - that is very, very important. Whenever you are called upon, you respond. You teach master classes to perspective students. On Board of Visitors Days, when we bring in student leaders from over the state, you participate and talk about academics. You participate in South Carolina Honors College interviews, which are very, very important. Very many of our accepted students will get a phone call from faculty members - particularly our scholarship-eligible students. Just about everyone of them will get a phone call from a faculty member. Your visits to the Governor's School, your teaching at the Governor's School - all of those things contribute to the fact that our enrollments have held steady and have instead increased a little bit.

So we feel that the time is right beginning with Fall 1998 to raise the predicted GPA to 2.35. Again that could mean that we may have 200 to 300 fewer students. But, with support from the administration and with **your** support, we can offset that decrease and have the very best students. So beginning with Fall 1998, a 2.35 will be required for regularly admitted students.

The motion was made for approval of Proposal A on page 21.

JOHN SPURRIER (SAT) asked if the students need a projected grade point ratio of 2.35 plus at least a C average on core high school requirements.

PROFESSOR BURNS said that they had to meet the high school requirements.

PROFESSOR SPURRIER (SAT) asked if the C average would still be in place under the proposal.

PROFESSOR BURNS said that did not change. The motion was passed.

PROFESSOR BURNS stated that as in the past, students who have the required high school coursework, but whose predicted grade point ratio is less than that necessary for regular admission (which is shall now be 2.35) but is greater than or equal to 2.10

shall be eligible for the Provisional Year program. Priority will be given to those students at the top of the prediction as you see here in the proposal and especially to residents of the State of South Carolina and, of course, our in-state/out-of-state ratio will not normally exceed the same ratio as it exists among regularly admitted students in the previous freshman class.

The motion was made for approval of Proposal B on page 21. The motion was passed.

PROFESSOR BURNS moved the approval of the following proposal:

Beginning with applications for the freshman class of Fall 1997, enrollment in the Provisional Year will permanently become 350 students, up from 250.

ROY SCHWARTZMAN (THSP) asked if provisions had been made to handle the increased numbers.

PROFESSOR BURNS said that the administration had given additional faculty support so the classes have remained small.

RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) asked how many provisional year students haven't made it.

PROFESSOR BURNS said that 60 to 70% of the students who started the program successfully completed it.

PROFESSOR CONANT asked how that compared with the general student body.

PROFESSOR BURNS said that he did not know the answer.

The motion was passed.

PROFESSOR BURNS moved the approval of the proposal on page 23:

This proposal is the result of legislation, and I want to read the beginning of that legislation to you so you understand what we are doing here. And then the rationale also exists there on the sheet. Again if you look on the bottom of your sheet on page 23 part of that legislation reads: "Any four-year institution which has institutional or programmatic admissions requirements for transfer students with cumulative grade point averages (GPAs) higher than 2.0 on 4.0 scale shall apply such entrance requirements equally to transfer students from regionally accredited South Carolina public institutions regardless of whether students are transferring from a four-year or two-year institution." Those transfer requirements are the same. After a long

discussion we figured a middle range would be an appropriate place to start. We figured that a 2.25 would be the minimum requirement. Now, as you are aware, the Admissions Committee only sets minimum admission requirements. The colleges have the prerogative to set higher requirements. I think some of them will come to you at a later meeting with those requirements. I think some of them will come to you at a later meeting with those requirements. So transfer applicants from regionally accredited colleges and universities are required to have a minimum grade point average of 2.25. We want to look at this new population and then look at it at a later time, and this is beginning with Fall 1998. The second part of that is just cleaning up the Bulletin. What we are doing there is just leaving out the colleges that have different requirements because those requirements will be stated in their own sections.

CHARLES WEASMER (GINT) asked if GPA requirements were different for freshmen and transfer students. He stated that it seemed logical to have the same requirements for freshmen and transfer students.

PROFESSOR BURNS said this is not projected that we are looking at for 2.25.

PROFESSOR WEASMER had concern that one group does not have to demonstrate the same competence as another group.

PROFESSOR BURNS said that each college has the prerogative to require higher standards.

BOB FELLERS (BIOL) asked about the number of courses on which one must achieve a grade point average of 2.25.

TERRY DAVIS (Admissions) stated that a student must meet this requirement if he had 30 semester hours or more of transfer credit. If a student had fewer than 30 semester hours they had to meet the new admission requirements. They must meet the prediction formula for freshmen.

The motion passed.

PROFESSOR BURNS moved the deletion of materials on page 24 which included the current wording with the title "Degree Program Entrance Requirements".

The motion was passed.

BRUCE MEGLINO (BADM) asked if the population that is in the projection equation has been constant over the last number of years.

TERRY DAVIS (Admissions) said that we validated it on the previous freshmen class.

**D. Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee, Professor Compton, Chair: No report.**

**IV. Report of Secretary**

The Bookstore Committee report was given by the Secretary.

A retirement planning seminar was announced for Tuesday, February 19, 1997.

A letter from the family of Dr. Charles W. Coolidge was read.

The address for the web page site for legislators was announced. It is: [www.lpittr.state.sc.us](http://www.lpittr.state.sc.us).

**V. Unfinished Business.**

None.

**VI. New Business.**

None.

**VII. Good of the Order**

PROFESSOR PRICE gave the following report about the gavel: John Herr is Professor Emeritus of this University, and John was instrumental in the Senate acquiring this particular gavel, which used to belong to Wade Batson (as a matter of fact, Wade Batson's father). John has been concerned over the years because the gavel would disappear from time to time and nobody knew exactly where it was. So, he said it needed to have some sort of receptacle so that it is too big to disappear any more. And, he acquired this very pretty box. It has a tag on it that says USC Faculty Senate May 20, 1970 with a line that is supposed to be directed to all of us who are here - "Author- ity with humility." I am going to, if you will allow me, read this very brief history of the gavel so you will know exactly in the future where it comes from. It says, "Professor Wade Batson once kept a rough hewn mallet in his office. A curious object which seemed out of place on a botanist's desk. The mallet dated from Wade's boyhood on the family farm, in Marietta, SC, and it was used by his father in the process of loading shotgun shells. Obviously, the mallet had much sentimental value for Wade. In 1974, Professor John Herr became the fifth Chair of the USC Faculty Senate. The first four chair called the body to order by rapping their

knuckles on the podium, and it occurred to him that the Faculty Senate should have an official gavel. The gavel should be unusual and of a symbolic nature, and Professor Batson's old mallet immediately came to mind. Rough-hewn and crude in its structure, but with unquestioned utility in the production of shotgun shells, this mallet would be the perfect instrument for calling the Senate to order and directing the formulation of academic policy and curriculum for the University. Its use in the past represents authority which is immediately tempered with humility by its crude form. To me, this mallet would properly symbolize the role of the Faculty Senate in University governance. Professor Batson agreed with that philosophical view and did not hesitate to allow his cherished mallet to become the symbol of that view. After the application of several coats of polyurethane, the crude mallet began its service as the official gavel of the USC Faculty Senate." And I can promise you that it will be passed on to Don Wedlock at an appropriate time this fall along with the box and the whole works. I wanted to share this with you. It is a very lovely box. The barn from which the wood came for this box, interestingly, was built in 1912, which was the year of Wade Batson's birth. So there is a connection running all through these things.

CHARLES WEASMER (GINT) urged the administration to keep in mind what Professor Mack said earlier about the desirability of the museum property. It may be an opportunity that justifies changes in master plans.

#### **VIII. Announcements.**

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15.

---

## **Attachments**

---

### **RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

The following Senators **did** attend the February 5, 1997 meeting:

APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES

Clodfelter

Regan

Stowe

## BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Fryer  
Harrington  
Rose  
Bauerschmidt  
Fiedler  
Meglino  
Roth  
Teng

## CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Fraser

## EDUCATION

Burnett  
Seaman  
Mitchell  
Hult

## ENGINEERING

Deng  
Weidner

## LIBERAL ARTS

Anthropology  
Gero

Art  
Wertz  
Collins  
Rose

English  
Thompson  
Hark  
Dawes  
Siebert

## French & Classics

Matsen  
Persels

Geography  
Stanley

Germanic, Slavic & Oriental  
Resch

GINT  
Weasmer

History  
Herzstein  
Schulz

Naval Science  
Hudson

Philosophy  
Donougho  
Khushf

Psychology  
Baylis  
Cafferty  
Davis

Religious Studies  
Evans

Spanish, Italian & Portuguese  
Lopes

Theatre, Speech & Dance  
Schwartzman

JOURNALISM  
Sidel  
Kornegay

LAW  
Cowden  
Adams  
Taylor

LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Bajjaly

MEDICINE

Adcock

Terracio

Greenhouse

Augustine

Baxley

Bowers

MUSIC

Taylor

Conant

Gowan

Davis

NURSING

Williams

PHARMACY

Metts

PUBLIC HEALTH

Environmental Health

Chandler

Epidemiology & Biostatistics

Sy

Exercise Science

Ainsworth

Health Administration

Baker

SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

Biology

Lawther

Feller

Chemistry  
Sodetz

Computer Science  
Eastman

Geology  
Gardner  
Owens  
Goni

Mathematics  
McNulty  
Stephenson  
Griggs  
Oskolkov

Physics & Astronomy  
Purohit  
Myher

Statistics  
Spurrier

SOCIAL WORK  
Choi

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES  
Birchfield  
Matthews  
Hansen  
Bilderback  
McKissick

REGIONAL CAMPUSES

Beaufort  
Tuttle  
Odom  
Miller

Lancaster  
Cureton  
Barry

Salkehatchie  
Strong

Sumter  
Hendley  
Safford  
Denny  
Maness

Union  
Barton

---

The following Senators **did not** attend the February 5, 1997 meeting:

**BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

Sicherman  
Harrison  
Malhotra

**EDUCATION**

Stevenson  
Holton  
Rowls  
Bowman

**ENGINEERING**

Beker  
Hudgins  
McAnally  
Ritter

**LIBERAL ARTS**

Aerospace Studies  
Caulder

English  
Kay

Geography  
Mitchell

GINT  
Love  
Rosati  
Lublin

History  
Ford

Military Science  
Tezza

Psychology  
Ford

Sociology  
Willer  
Carlson

Spanish, Italian & Portuguese  
Hill

JOURNALISM  
Drewniany

LAW  
Cross  
Freeman

MEDICINE  
Howden  
Bacon  
Davis  
Wolf

## NURSING

Mackey

Russell

## PHARMACY

Kozma

Michniak-Mikolaczak

## PUBLIC HEALTH

## SPAD

Frank

## SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

Biology

Vogt

Mousseau

Chemistry

Lebioda

## SOCIAL WORK

Cascio

## REGIONAL CAMPUSES

Lancaster

Catalano

Lifelong Learning

Allman

Salkehatchie

Bowers