

# **Faculty Senate Meeting March 5, 1997**

**The meeting was called to order by Professor Henry Price, Chair.**

## **Approval of Minutes of the meeting of February 5, 1997**

The minutes were approved as presented with the following correction:

Professor Caroline Eastman (CSCI) said that her department sought clarification from the committee concerning the application of the guidelines to an existing special topics course which had been given during the previous May Session. The department was told by the committee that such courses did not require further review.

## **II. Reports of Officers**

### **A. Report of President John M. Palms:**

Thank you. I hope you are not confused. This is not summer session even though it is 84 degrees outside. Unbelievable. A very busy time; I don't have to tell you how busy it is. I know you are going to have a little break with spring break, at least from the students.

Our major concern is, of course, the legislature. We are trying to hang in there with decent salary increases for faculty and staff. It is going to continue to be a struggle. It will probably be a struggle until the last week in May, as we debate now in the house and then in the senate, but we are watching it very carefully. Our major message to them is that we are still about \$1,500 dollars behind allocations per student as compared to our nearest neighbors, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia. We just must make up for some of this. The good news is that at least we are still holding onto the bond bill, which is about \$30 million and will provide about \$15 million for the Columbia campus. Five million dollars is still in there for our science building, and that is very important as we run out of space to do our research. And, there is still money in there committed to the arena, which will be a Midlands-supported partnership with the city, Lexington County, and Richland County. Although you are probably reading that there are some concerns with annexation issues dealing with the city and Lexington, nothing is for sure but we are continuing work on that particular issue.

I want to thank you for participating in raising the standards. It is nice to turn the radio on and hear the talk shows talk about the inequity of raising the standards on our Columbia campus. But as you know our applicant pool is up about 15%. The SAT of our applicant pool is up about 10%. We have 700 more freshmen admitted for next

year's class at this time than we did last year at this time. I had the privilege of calling on Saturday and Sunday the 30 or so students we're offering Carolina Scholars awards to. We are trying to get 20 of those to matriculate at the University. I like to call them to tell them that they had been selected and to hear where else they are also applying. Every year I do this, I find the quality of the competition rising. There are more of these Carolina Scholar awardees who are also applying to Ivy League schools, to Duke, Virginia, Chicago and Stanford, and places of that nature. So the competition is fierce, but the fact is that these kinds of students are interested enough in being considered for Carolina Scholars to go through the effort of applying. And again for the faculty who participated in the evaluation of these students, I want to thank you. I think we are going to have another very, very good crop. It is very important for us to get this leadership in the freshman class. You know we have increased the size of the Honors College. We are trying to get more students there. And these Carolina Scholars, the Honors College students, and the Alumni Scholars will add significantly to the quality of the freshman class.

Campaign update. We are continuing to get a very good response in this so-called "quiet phase" of the campaign. Our target for this year is to reach \$40 million. If we do that, we will have raised almost \$75 million so far in the campaign. We have about 400 volunteers working on this campaign, and we are soliciting all over the country. I was in Houston last week. I will be in New York next week, then to Atlanta. We've found people, uncovered Carolina graduates. One man who is worth more than one-half billion dollars and graduated 30 years ago has never been asked for a dime by the University. We really started from scratch as far as putting a systematic data base together. We now have about 17,000 prospects. I could ask for money everyday for the remainder of my tenure no matter how long it is and we won't make a dent in that. So we have a lot of help, a lot of volunteers. We appreciate your working with the Development Offices that we have placed in the various colleges. They are really doing an outstanding job, and this is serious business. This is one of the bottom-of-the-line tasks: you ask for so much, you make so many calls a day, so many calls a week, so many solicitations, you identify people, and you deliver for us. As you know we have to spend money to make money. We are spending about 12 cents on the dollar. But it is still 12 cents you have to come up with. Some of those dollars won't come in until bequests are read -- at the end of people's lives. So it is still a matter of trust that you make that investment. But other schools have done this. They are way ahead of us. When you have the University of Virginia's latest numbers, their endowment is almost \$1 billion -- a public institution, Chapel Hill, is close to \$400 million, the University of Georgia is close to \$300 million, and we are at about \$102 million. So we have a lot of catching up to do. But I think we have realized the need for that challenge. Very, very important for us.

We have been cited or certainly have been accused of not being well-organized to participate in economic development in this state. Who do you call at the University when there is a prospect? Do you call the College of Business Administration? Do you call the College of Engineering? Do you call the College of Science and Mathematics' departments? Or do you call the Department of Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism Administration? We have organized a President's Council on Economic Development. Doug Dobson is head of that, and we have representation from the various colleges that have a direct responsibility for economic development. We had a meeting here kicking that off last week. We had our Secretary of Commerce here, Bob Royall, who has endorsed this and is promoting it. The Governor is aware of this. So hopefully we will get a little more credit. There is an awful lot going on, but it is not coherently coordinated. This will do that and allow us to maybe publicize more effectively all the initiatives that we have and how effective we have been in attracting industry here, in promoting industry, and in creating new industry. We are starting to see the creation of businesses that arise from the activities that are going on in this institution. We have not started the cloning industry, yet. There is a joke about that. There has been so much success about cloning that they've contracted with a rock group to make a song about cloning. The first group they contacted was U2.

We are making progress on the final analysis in the search for the Provost. I am working it on this every minute. Getting a lot of calls, getting a lot of advice. Making a number of calls myself. I visited the campus of one of our candidates. Spent the whole day, and we are getting very close. Within the next couple of days, maybe by tomorrow, I will be able to make that announcement. I will be glad to answer any questions.

Professor Carol McGinnis Kay (ENGL) asked if the leaf blowers could be scheduled when classes are not in session.

President Palms said he would be glad to do that. He announced a special called faculty meeting for Thursday, March 6, 1997, at 4:00 p.m.

### **B. Report of Interim Provost Donald Greiner:**

That 4 o'clock meeting, by the way, is in the auditorium of the College of Business Administration tomorrow.

Good afternoon. I have more good news to report to you. As you know two of the most competitive national fellowships for undergraduates are the Mellon and the Truman. We have not had one of our undergraduates named a Mellon fellow for about five to six years. During the past two years we have had extraordinary success with the Truman Scholarship competition. As you know we had one Truman Scholar two

years ago and a Truman finalist last year. The Truman Scholarship, by the way, is worth \$30,000, which will go along way toward your Graduate School. I am pleased to report to you that the University has a Truman finalist and a Mellon finalist. The two very fine undergraduates are being interviewed at the national level this very week. We are, obviously, awaiting the results.

I also wanted to report to you the names of our colleagues who have just been awarded grants from the Provost Teaching Development fund. These are the Spring 1997 recipients. Each year, each semester actually, the number of applicants increases. I'm going to read the names for the record, but you will notice that there are 14 colleagues in 11 different colleges across the University:

Annette Appell - Law  
Bob Feller - Marine Science  
Jim Hightower - Medicine  
Vance Kornegay - Journalism  
Jed Lyons - Engineering  
Robert Matyska - Retailing  
Doug Meade - Mathematics  
Michael Petrou - Engineering  
Cathy Pike - Social Work  
Scott Price - Music  
Virginia Scotchie - Art  
Patrick Scott - Thomas Cooper Library  
John Wardrip - Journalism  
Kathleen Whitcomb - Business Administration

An extraordinary cross section of the faculty. If you don't know about these grants, get in touch with Ward Briggs or with me. We have this competition twice a year.

Finally, I want to report one of the best pieces of news that I've had in my many years here as your colleague. Most of you know that the Hesburgh Award is the so-called academy award for institutions of higher learning. The award is named for the Revered Father Hesburgh who, I think, was for 35 years President of the University of Notre Dame. The award is given to only five schools annually. The award is presented for excellence in undergraduate education and faculty development. It normally goes to smaller schools or to private institutions. Because of your extraordinary commitment to our new undergraduate initiatives such as Preston Residential College, the first-year reading experience, and the fellowships office that I just referred to, University 101, the pre-professional office which is looking after (it is in its first year of work) our pre-med and pre-law students, because of your work -- obviously the faculty were crucial to the success of these initiatives -- the University of South

Carolina has been awarded one of those five certificates of excellence from the Hesburgh Commission. Just Monday a week ago, President Clinton and Secretary Riley presented the award to the University at a luncheon in Washington attended by 2,000 people. Even to publicize the Hesburgh award, the Hesburgh Committee will take out full page ads in the Chronicle of Higher Education, for example, and US News and World Report and other such media. I am very very grateful to all of you. This is a high point in my many years here working with you as we have achieved this excellence. Obviously the Hesburgh award will go along way to helping us in the capital campaign and in recruiting the very kind of students that President Palms alluded to in his remarks to you. So please accept my thanks and gratitude. That is all I have. Thank you.

Professor Price asked faculty to state name, department, and to speak loudly for the transcript of the minutes. He asked Professor Robert Patterson (HIST) to report on the President's Ad Hoc Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.

### **C. Report of Professor Robert Patterson (HIST):**

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I hope when people identify themselves clearly for the purpose of record nobody will say John or Jane Doe. That will cause a little consternation.

I was asked earlier this year to keep you up to date on the doings of this very important committee. Remember we are an appointed Presidential Committee, and we have been spending the year studying various issues associated with our tenure and promotion process. What I did was to divide the committee into ten subcommittees; each one of the subcommittees in their own way probed, you might say, the matters under investigation, then made reports to the full 17 person committee. As an indication of how far that committee has come, tomorrow the last of the subcommittees will make its report. That is why I hope none of us will be there at 4 o'clock for the General Faculty meeting. Once that subcommittee report has been made we will then turn to the difficult task of writing a draft report. The draft report is going to be put together by myself in conjunction with a small subcommittee; then it will be submitted for parliamentary treatment by the full 17-person committee. After the full committee has dealt with it, we will then present it to the President. The President will then decide what of our recommendations he wants to recommend to the General Faculty as The Faculty Manual requires for treatment. But that is where we are.

I would also like to say that the report that is going to be made tomorrow will be the report dealing with the faculty survey. It is your ultimate responsibility as a voting faculty -- the general faculty -- to approve any amendments or changes in the tenure

and promotion system. So we felt that it was particularly important, right, and appropriate for you all to be solicited. I want to compliment the faculty as a whole through this body for the response rate that we got. You might be interested to know that 1,062 surveys were sent out. Supposedly this represents the tenure track faculty at the University. 638 were returned and this is a return rate of 60%. So this is something to be very proud of. We are very grateful because we want to be influenced by some of your comments. This by the way stands in contrast to the 20% return rate of department chairs on a survey of their concerns. I don't intend to give them a compliment this afternoon.

I would like to make some comments about the faculty survey other than just point out that we think it is a great success. The Institutional Planning and Analysis people told us that it represents the highest percentage of faculty participation in a survey in their memory. Of the responses, about 48% are full professors. The average age of our youthful faculty, that is of the respondents, is 49. A very high percentage of our respondents reveal experience with the tenure and promotion system -- the highest as you might expect from the unit level with less on the UCTP and so on. For example 50% voted in a General Faculty Meeting on T&P matters. So we have some people who are experienced in University affairs who have taken the trouble of responding to our survey and that enhances its quality. 86% of our respondents felt in one way or another that unit guidelines clearly identify criteria. 75% one way or another (this means strongly agree/agree added together) believe in the fairness of the local application of criteria. 59% consider that the faculty guidelines for the tenure and promotion system are satisfactory, albeit could be improved in some way. So we have a high confidence level from our colleagues in the system that we already have, although there is some desire for improvement. That is what I would like to address further with a couple of remarks.

As you may remember from the faculty survey, we included on it an open-ended question because we wanted people without any prodding to have the opportunity to say what they felt was right about the system or what was wrong about it or a combination thereof. And, a large number of people, 58%, took the time to write us messages. Of those answers so far some 70 themes have been identified. One of the major concerns is that unit criteria need greater clarification in one way or another. A lot of people feel that there is a wide variation of standards between academic units, and that is a challenge for everybody who is involved in the tenure and promotion system, to which there is probably no simple answer. Not surprisingly, there are some villains. As a former chair and member of the UCTP, I can point out to you that one of the areas that at least represents the perception of many is that the UCTP's functioning may have gone beyond its stated prerogatives or its stated functions. Administration does not entirely escape from this criticism as you might expect.

So these are several areas that will be discussed no doubt in great detail tomorrow afternoon and will be represented in our final report. Once again, thank you all so very much. This is your business, and you have demonstrated that you care about it. I'll be happy to answer any questions, Mr. Chairman.

### **III. Reports of Committees**

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

Committee Nominations:

Academic Responsibility - Steven Wilson  
Admissions - Charles Wilbanks  
University Athletics Advisory - John Bauer and W. Lewis Burke  
Board of Governors - Faculty House, Shirley Kuiper  
Curricula and Courses - Don Edwards and William Jacoby  
Faculty Advisory - Gerasimos Augustinos and Margit Resch  
Faculty Budget - James Edwards  
Faculty Grievance - Barry Freedom and Roger Sargent  
Faculty Welfare - Alan Bauerschmidt and Caroline Eastman  
Honorary Degrees - Ronald Farrar and Patrick Scott  
Instructional Development - Stefanie Buck, Phillip Dunn, and Miriam Freeman  
Libraries - Owen Connelly and Dwight Underhill  
Patent and Copyright - Arthur Cohen and Lawrence James  
Savannah River Review - Douglas Dobson and Pradeep Talwani  
Scholastic Standards and Petitions - Carter Bays and Judith Rink  
Scholastic Standards and Petitions (Continuing Education) - Robert Janiskee  
Tenure Review Board - Harvey Starr  
University Disability Affairs, Thorne Compton

Dr. Wiebke Strehl, Department of Germanic, Slavic & Oriental Languages was nominated for Scholastic Standards and Petitions.

The date for the summer Faculty Senate meeting is July 1, 1997, at 3:00 p.m.

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

The committee report was approved as submitted.

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

Section I, College of Applied Professional Sciences was approved after Professor Caroline Eastman (CSCI) asked for clarification related to RETL 201 and RETL 301 on page 25.

Section II, College of Business Administration, Department of Economics, on pages 26 to 35 was withdrawn for consideration at the April meeting.

Professor Stan Fryer (BADM) asked what effect this would have on the publication of the catalog in the fall.

Professor Lane said this would have no effect on the catalog.

Section II, College of Business Administration, Department of Accounting, ACCT 222 was approved as submitted.

Section II, College of Business Administration, Department of Economics, ECON 223 and ECON 224 were approved with the following course descriptions:

ECON 223 INTRODUCTION TO ECONOMICS. (3) Introduction to economics principles for nonmajors. Basics of supply and demand and government and monetary policy are covered in a nontechnical manner. Not open to business or economics students.

ECON 224 PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMICS. (3) Micro- and macroeconomic principles of markets, government policy, and household or firm decision-making. Open to all students. Credit not granted for both ECON 224 and 221 or 222.

Professor Caroline Eastman (CSCI) stated that she saw no problem with these courses as presented, but she had a problem with the fact that faculty did not see them until they got the Faculty Senate agenda. She noted that their Computer Science students took both Accounting and Economic courses, so this would make a change in their curriculum desirable and there was no way they could get changes to Curricula and Courses by the Friday meeting.

Professor Lane said that they stand warned.

Section II, College of Business Administration, Department of Finance, FINA 363 was approved as submitted.

Section II, College of Business Administration, Department of Management, items listed were approved with the following description changes:

MGMT 374 - A survey of the major approaches used in managing human resources. Covers selection, compensation, legal compliance, discipline, organizational restructuring, TQM, motivation, labor relations, and performance management.

MGMT 474 - This course covers in detail topics from MGMT 374. Involves students in problem-solving activities and in-depth analysis of cases, using concepts from MGMT 374 and 376.

Section II, College of Business Administration, Department of Management Science, items on pages 38 to 41 were approved with the following changes:

Description of MGSC 594 - Concepts, techniques and applications of decision support and expert technologies. Overview of decision support systems, executive information systems, data mining and warehousing, expert systems, and neural networks.

Crosslisting added to MGMT 250: [ENGL 463]

Section III, College of Education, was approved after EDCE 510 was withdrawn.

Section IV, College of Engineering, was approved.

Section V, College of Journalism and Mass Communications, was approved.

Section VI, College of Liberal Arts:

A. Department of African-American Studies Program - AFRO 398 was approved.

B. Department of Art - ARTS 570 was withdrawn for consideration at the April meeting.

C. Department of Geography - GEOG 512, GEOG 513, and GEOG 575 were withdrawn. All other courses were approved.

Professor Bob Gardner (GEOL) voiced concern that Landform Geography overlaps considerably with Principles of Geomorphology.

Professor Charles Weasmer (GINT) asked if a new course description was needed for GEOG 211.

Professor John Winberry (GEOG) responded that the new title does correspond with what is taught in the course.

D. Department of Germanic, Slavic, Oriental Languages and Literatures - Professor Lane stated that CHIN 341 is CHIN 321 and that GERM 316 should read: Development of basic language and cultural skills necessary for functioning in the professional world of German-speaking countries. In the description for GERM 416, add "Preparation for standardized exams."

All items were approved as amended.

Professor Margit Resch (GERM) said that GERM 311 is the prerequisite for 316, and 316 is the prerequisite for GERM 416 in response to Professor David Rembert's (Science & Math) question.

F. Department of Religious Studies was approved.

G. Department of Theatre, Speech and Dance curriculum change was approved after THSP 577 was withdrawn for consideration at the April meeting.

Section VII, College of Nursing was approved with the following changes: ELECT - UNIV 101 (3 hours) is now followed by (recommended). The ELECT in front of CHEM 101 is removed.

Section VIII, College of Library and Information Science was withdrawn for consideration at the April meeting.

Section IX, School of Public Health:

A. Department of Health Administration courses were approved.

B. Department of Exercise Science courses on pages 55 and 56 as well as EXSC 530 were withdrawn for consideration at the April meeting. EXSC 482 and the deletions: EXSC 223L, 224L and 336 were approved.

C. Department of Environmental Health Sciences courses were approved as amended.

D. Department of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology - SPAD 521 was withdrawn for April meeting.

Section X, College of Science and Mathematics:

A. Department of Marine Science curriculum and course changes were approved with the following change:

MSCI 101 THE PRESENT-DAY MARINE ENVIRONMENT. (3) (Majors in marine science or consent of instructor; prereq or coreq: MSCI 101L) Fundamental environmental concepts with special emphasis on the sea. Analysis of abiotic and biotic parameters. Energetics and resource management of marine ecosystems.

Section XI, Southern Studies courses were approved with the following changes:

SOST 399 credit hours should read: (3-6). SOST 405 description should read: Reading and research on selected topics in Southern Studies. Course content varies and will be announced in the schedule of courses by suffix and title.

Section XII, May Session Courses - For the Senate's information only:

Professor G. B. Lane said that RETL 592M and FILM 566M will be considered at the next Curricula and Courses meeting.

Section XIII, Experimental Courses - For the Senate's information only:

Professor G. B. Lane said that MKTG 452X and GEOL 210X will be considered at the next Curricula and Courses meeting.

Professor Henry Price (Chair) expressed thanks to the Senate for their patience and to the Curricula and Courses Committee for their hard work.

Professor Leroy Brooks (BADM) asked for clarification on why Business Administration curriculum were not being considered.

Professor G. B. Lane said the Committee did not get the necessary letters from GINT and THSP thus it could not be considered until the next meeting.

Professor Henry Price (Chair) encouraged Senators with questions about items offered in the agenda to call committee chairs before the meeting.

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

D. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Robert Wilcox, Chair:

There are a couple of matters I want to bring to the attention of the Senate that do not need action. I think you would be interested in the information. One is that the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs has proposed amendments to the sexual harassment procedures for the University. These are currently being circulated for comment and the Welfare Committee has met with representatives of that office and are preparing our comments on them. We have also asked the office to place those proposed

changes on the home page of the University so that you can look at them. If you have an interest in that, we will be finalizing our comments probably the week after spring break, perhaps a week later. If you would correspond to me with any comments that you have we would be happy to consider them.

Two particular aspects jump out at us as being of note. One of them is the change in time frames for investigating sexual harassment complaints. The current procedures provide that the investigation will normally be complete within 15-30 working days which is 3 to 6 weeks. They are proposing doubling that so it will be 6 to 12 weeks. We are somewhat concerned by the length of the investigation going 3 months on a charge like this. The rationale given for the need is that is effectively what they are taking any way because they are so shorthanded over there. It is not real clear how lengthening the time they have will solve that problem. We think they will still have the same number of claims and still the same number of people. It may well be that our comments will take the lines, if it is such a problem, that the University needs to hire more people to handle the investigations, rather than simply lengthening the time they have. They will create a backlog going in the direction that they are going.

The second change that is of note is the change in who is entitled to receive information from the investigation of a complaint. The rules currently provide that the information from the investigation shall be made available to the parties and to the appropriate university officials. It is recommended that that be changed. It would not be available to the parties and it would be available to university officials with a need to know the language they have. We are again concerned exactly what that means in terms of the information that is available. The rationale given is to protect witnesses and complainants from harassment and retaliation. We are certainly sympathetic to those concerns, but, on the other hand, we also believe that we have to provide some ability for the person to know who is charging them and to know who the witnesses are corroborating the charges and, indeed, if there are witnesses that do not corroborate the charge. The information we have received, I would characterize as somewhat conflicting on the subject. What we are told is don't worry about it. You get that information any way. Our question is, if that is the case, the policy ought to be clear about what you are entitled to and when you get it. This information should not be something that you just get by some offhand way. So I mention both of those to the faculty for your advice and comments on that.

Professor Joan Gero (ANTH) asked how opinions and views could be channeled to the Committee.

Professor Wilcox said to e-mail them to [Robbie@law.law.sc.edu](mailto:Robbie@law.law.sc.edu) or mail them directly to him at the Law School.

Professor Carol McGinnis Kay (ENGL) expressed concern that the revisions that are coming forward do not permit the people who will be accused of sexual harassment to know who the witnesses are or the exact date or nature of the alleged offense.

Professor Wilcox said that the policies do provide that you are entitled to a summary as the accused of the report from the investigation.

Professor Kay stated that the summary comes at the end of due process. Therefore, the person who is accused does not have a chance to respond and change the findings.

Professor Wilcox encouraged Senators to inform their departments that this is being considered and that the current procedures and the proposed changes are on the web page.

Professor Wilcox said that the second issue of interest to you is that we have been trying to follow up on the results of the task force on salary equity from years ago. I wish the President and the Provost were here. Several years ago that task force, as I understand the process, took essentially a two prong approach to salary equity issues. There were potential gender and race problems on the one side and there were faculty salary compression issues as the other prong. We have been trying to ensure that the work of this task force which issued a voluminous report 2 or 3 years ago, is not simply filed away and lost. The information that I can share with you at this point, that we have been able to gather from our inquiries, is that the gender race issues have been addressed. The ones that were identified at that time were resolved at least as of the end of past year. Those issues have been largely addressed, if not totally addressed, and there appears to be in place the University level a committee that will continue to monitor those issues, to ensure that we do not go back to a problem with equity in the gender and race side. As for the compression issues, we are not as comfortable that those matters have been addressed as deliberately as the gender and race issues. We have requested information regarding the extent to which specific recommendations of the task force have either been implemented by the University or rejected by the University. The best information that we have been able to gather to this point is that some of the relatively discreet points of the recommendations have been implemented. There are such things as chair review and that type of stuff have been implemented. But that by and large, other than for allowing deans out of their money every year to make some accommodations of compression problems, perhaps even encouraging them to some extent, there really hasn't been any deliberate effort, perhaps because of financial reasons. As the University was addressing these other issues immediately, there has been no real push to address the compression problems. What we are more concerned by than that, quite frankly, is there does not seem to be any one entity that is really responsible for monitoring the progress on addressing these issues. We believe as a committee that there is a need for the University to

establish some very clear body or office or something -- we would recommend a special committee following up on the work of the special task force -- that would be in place with the charge to monitor and report periodically to the faculty and to the University on the progress, if any, that has been made in this area. At the moment I cannot report to you whether there has been progress or not. I suspect there has been some just because of bringing up the gender and race issues. We probably have addressed some of the compression issues indirectly, but we don't have the information for you. We will address that, but I can tell you at the moment that it is the sense of the Committee that this is something that needs to be raised with the new provost. I don't think we will do it before 4:15 tomorrow afternoon, but as soon as is practical, we need to alert the provost to these concerns and to indeed to provide some mechanism. In the interim, the Welfare Committee will have to do what it can in this regard to assure that the compression issues aren't simply lost in the shuffle. We are not content at the moment with where that stands and I just wanted to report that to you.

Professor Richard Zingmark (MSCI) said the task force report was just that: a report to the Provost and was only given as information to the faculty. The Faculty Welfare Committee took the compression-related recommendations of the report and brought them forward to the Faculty Senate for discussion and ratification -- so the recommendations would not die and to give the administration a greater sense of faculty concern and support. Compression is caused when market forces raise salaries faster than internal raises. I recall that, besides the establishment of a faculty salary monitoring committee, another of the Faculty Welfare's Committee recommendations was to tie all faculty salaries at all ranks to the Southeastern University averages for each university discipline. Salaries of new hires would reflect these averages as would annual increments of our current faculty. Thus, before you go to a lot of time and trouble, I think it crucial that you resurrect the minutes of the Senate meeting (approximately November or December 1995) that passed substantive issues related to salary compression. There is no need to re-invent the wheel, although you might be able to improve the design.

Professor John Spurrier (STAT) said that some action has been taken on this. As Chair of his department, he was sent a list from the administration through the dean to one of the faculty in the department who might be suffering from salary compression and that was taken into account in the salary raises.

Professor Wilcox said he would appreciate any information about salary compression that faculty can provide.

E. Committee on Admission, Professor Jim Burns, Chair: No report.

F. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor Thorne Compton,  
Chair:

All the changes in this report are changes that colleges proposed to our committee and to the Senate in order to bring their college statements in line with the new admission requirements. As you remember from our last meeting, one of the things that had to happen was that in the past we have two different sense of transfer admission requirements -- one for people transferring from two-year institutions and one from four-year institutions and we were required to do away with that differential. Colleges and departments made those changes in a variety of different ways and they are summarized in my letter to Henry Price and then you have also attached to that those changes that took place. I move all of those changes.

The changes on pages 63, 64, 65, and 66 were approved.

#### **IV. Report of the Secretary: No Report.**

#### **V. Unfinished Business**

Professor Richard Conant (MUSC) said that he had the Senate and House e-mail addresses. He thought it would be helpful if they were disseminated to the entire faculty.

Professor Price said that it could be put on the WEB.

#### **VI. New Business: None**

Professor Price declared the nominations closed and one ballot will be sent out.

#### **VII. Good of the Order: None**

#### **VIII. Announcements**

Professor Richard Conant (MUSC) asked for clarification on the reason for the meeting at 4:00 p.m. Thursday.

Professor Price said that he did not have an answer.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

#### **Attachments**

---

## RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

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

### APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES

Clodfelter

Stowe

### BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Fryer

Harrington

Bauerschmidt

Fiedler

Meglino

Malhotra

Teng

### CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Fraser

### EDUCATION

Holton

Seaman

Mitchell

Hult

### ENGINEERING

Weidner

McAnally

Ritter

### LIBERAL ARTS

#### **Aerospace Studies**

Caulder

#### **Anthropology**

Gero

#### **Art**

Wertz

**English**

Kay  
Hark

**French & Classics**

Matsen  
Persels

**Geography**

Mitchell

**Germanic, Slavic & Oriental Languages**

Resch

**GINT**

Weasmer  
Lublin

**History**

Schulz

**Philosophy**

Donougho  
Khushf

**Psychology**

Cafferty  
Davis

**Religious Studies**

Evans

**Sociology**

Willer  
Carlson

**Spanish, Italian & Portuguese**

Lopes  
Hill

**Theatre, Speech & Dance**

Schwartzman

## JOURNALISM

Drewniany  
Kornegay

## LAW

Cross  
Adams  
Freeman  
Taylor

## LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Bajjaly

## MEDICINE

Adcock  
Greenhouse  
Wolf  
Augustine  
Baxley  
Bowers

## MUSIC

Taylor  
Conant  
Gowan  
Davis

## NURSING

Mackey  
Williams  
Russell

## PHARMACY

Michniak-Mikolaczak  
Metts

## PUBLIC HEALTH

### **Exercise Science**

Ainsworth

**SPAD**

Frank

SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

**Biology**

Lawther

Vogt

Feller

Mousseau

**Chemistry**

Lebioda

**Computer Science**

Eastman

**Geology**

Gardner

**Mathematics**

Stephenson

Griggs

Oskolkov

**Physics & Astronomy**

Purohit

**Statistics**

Spurrier

SOCIAL WORK

Choi

Cascio

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Matthews

Hansen

Bilderback

REGIONAL CAMPUSES

**Beaufort**

Odom

**Lancaster**

Catalano

**Lifelong Learning**

Allman

**Sumter**

Denny

Maness

**Union**

Barton

---

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

APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES

Regan

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Rose

Sicherman

Roth

Harrison

EDUCATION

Stevenson

Burnett

Rowls

Bowman

ENGINEERING

Beker

Hudgins

Deng

LIBERAL ARTS

**Art**

Collins

Rose

**English**

Thompson

Dawes

Siebert

**Geography**

Stanley

**GINT**

Love

Rosati

**History**

Ford

Herzstein

**Military Science**

Tezza

**Naval Science**

Hudson

**Psychology**

Baylis

Ford

**JOURNALISM**

Sidel

**LAW**

Cowden

**MEDICINE**

Terracio

Howden

Bacon

Davis

PHARMACY

Kozma

PUBLIC HEALTH

**Environmental Health**

Chandler

**Epidemiology & Biostatistics**

Sy

**Health Administration**

Baker

SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

**Chemistry**

Sodetz

**Geology**

Owens

Goni

**Mathematics**

McNulty

**Physics & Astronomy**

Myhrer

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Birchfield

McKissick

REGIONAL CAMPUSES

**Beaufort**

Tuttle

Miller

**Lancaster**

Cureton

Barry

**Salkehatchie**

Bowers

Strong

**Sumter**

Hendley

Safford