

## MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING, APRIL 5, 1989

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

### I. Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved as distributed.

### II. Reports of Officers

President James B. Holderman briefly reported on three items.

1. Budget: The budget is now being discussed by the Senate Finance Subcommittee on Higher Education. We continue to push the 8 percent salary increase as our first priority. Such a package would require \$6m for all the state system of higher education.

2. Hays Associates: This is a group that helps us develop salary ranges for administrators and faculty. The president has asked them to desist in referring to higher education as state agencies. He believes he has made his point.

3. Richland Memorial Hospital: The administration is meeting with hospital officials on matters beyond the budget. We, including our medical faculty, have many substantive concerns. There are alternatives to the RMH association and those are being explored. It is the administration's belief that we are a tremendous advantage to RMH and in many ways they have been a good host to us, but things must improve in the future or the relationship can not continue.

Professor Weasmer (GINT) wanted to know what action the University was taking on the Senate request to the legislature to restore the money taken from the state health plan? Holderman said they were doing exactly what the Senate resolution asked to be done.

Fellers announced he had written a letter to the members of the Richland and Lexington County delegations, the Budget and Control Board, the Governor's Office, Mr. Fred Sheheen and others. He has received about one dozen replies and it appears that the funds removed will be restored by the end of the year.

Weasmer felt that the Senate should give some sort of public recognition to the "marvelous" letter on the subject to The State. The Senate responded with a round of applause.

Professor Mack (ARTH) pointed out Professor Disterheft had raised the matter of low salaries paid to faculty participating in Continuing Education programs, and wondered if any action had been taken to explore or correct the matter? Holderman said the Provost would speak to this matter.

Professor Aylward (FORL) wanted to know if anyone was speaking out on "our" behalf about the imposition of mandatory case management in the state health plan? Holderman said we were expressing our concern.

Professor Resch (FORL) said the Department of Foreign Languages was concerned over the distribution of monies going to redressing salary inequities. She listed the following points to show her concern.

1. Of the \$1m in the pot last year, FORL received an amount which would average about \$300 per faculty member.
2. Clemson University has hired one of her colleagues with a \$10,000 raise in salary.
3. Of the 60 some faculty in the department, 90% make less than South Carolina high school teachers. Thirty-seven members provide 30 hours of instruction in the MIBS program, top ranked in the nation, and most are being paid less than high school teachers.

She ended by saying "the University administration should be embarrassed", and wanted to know how the inequities would be addressed? Holderman thanked her for the question and said the \$1m went totally to help address salary inequities. However, the amount was not enough to redress the problem but some progress had been made.

Dean Carol Kay (HUSS) said she did not disagree with the fact that FORL salaries need attention. She also pointed out that based on southeastern averages the first priorities last year were Anthropology (18% below) and Religious Studies (15% below) while FORL was 4.7% below. FORL received an 8% increase last year while the University pool was 6% as was the college pool.

She felt the overall problem pointed up the need for keeping the equity pool at the central administration level. In order to make last year's changes she had to withhold an equity amount from the college regular funds or 1.5% of the 6% allotted.

Professor Wedlock (LAWS) asked that some consideration be given to the parking situation in Lot D2. There is a major problem now that the Koger Center has been brought on line.

Professor Becker (HIST), as chair of the parking committee, said this committee is working on a comprehensive review of

parking on campus. As an advisory committee, the report will be sent to the president. He expressed the hope that the recommendations in the report would help matters, but realist that he is, he did not believe parking would ever be made perfect.

Weasmer (GINT) brought the discussion back to salary inequities by pointing out that the explanations had been based on averages of rank and dealt with by college and department, not by individual. If 10% below average of rank is the criteria for basing an inequity, then in his department there are at least 6 professors who are below the 10% and, if these are not corrected, is it an oversight, indifference, or they are not deserving?

Holderman said he felt the salary situation had to be dealt with at the college and department level. He noted he reviews the salary recommendations each year as they come from the departments and colleges. He did not believe he had intervened in more than 10 cases in the last 12 years. It has been left heavily to the departments and colleges. If there was a strong feeling of the Senate that the President and Provost look at individual cases and participate with the deans and chairs, they would reluctantly do that.

Professor Marshall (GINT) agreed that most salary discussions focus on averages, but the averages are based on the combined salaries of many different people hired under different conditions. He felt some of the problem comes from recent appointments at much higher salaries than in the past and as a result we have a two-tiered salary structure across campus. The \$1m a year divided up among such a large pool will not correct the problem. He felt this was no ones particular fault but a reality.

Holderman said he believed this was the case, but that he was aware of the inequities. He went on to point out that we are running way behind on formula funding - \$100 to \$120m per year and this situation must change drastically if we are to compare favorably with other states.

Provost Arthur K. Smith said he wished to clarify Prof. Weasmer's 10% below the median by rank as a definition of inequity. The procedure used was to obtain the numbers of individuals (and the individuals) who were 10% or below the median salary for their rank. These were presented to the deans and chairs as indicators of a potential inequitable situation, but not necessarily as evidence of inequity because there may be a number of factors that might explain such a difference, such as time in rank or merit basis. The procedure will be followed again this year with deans and chairs being asked to focus on these individuals as areas of possible inequity.

As to the Continuing Education salaries, the Faculty Welfare Committee's recommendation for compensation of full-time faculty at a rate of 6.25% of the 9 month salary continues to be discussed. The committee was asked if the problem might be

approached by keeping a flat salary but raising the amount to \$2,000 per course? The committee responded by staying with their earlier recommendation. The Provost is ready to make that recommendation to the President for the forthcoming academic year. He pointed out that this would have to come from any new money in our budget for 1989-90.

Professor Sederberg (GINT) asked for a clarification of the policies in regard to meeting counter offers, special early retirement packages and packages to incoming departmental chairs. Specifically he wished to know if the money will come from the standard departmental salary pool as it is now or from a university pool as in the past.

Smith said that if a counter offer is made, the package is an individual one and may involve a commitment from a dean to consider something from the salary package that is available in the college. In terms of incoming chairs, usually the package has come out of money generally available to the college budget and not as a mortgage on the next round of salary increases. In the case of early retirement special packages, some may come from the salary pool.

He then said that these cases are individually catered and in all three categories some would probably involve a commitment from faculty salary raise packages yet to come down. In other cases, some may come entirely from funds already in a college budget. Such packages would not involve a transfer of funds from another college.

Sederberg pointed out a problem may exist if a faculty member uses a counter offer or a potential department chair seeks to simply increase their salary basis.

Smith said in terms of meeting counter offers, "The University is damned if it does and damned if it does not". He proceeded to give examples.

Weasmer referred to Sederberg's original question of does the money necessary for all these packages, including new hires, come from new and additional money or from what is already in the pool? If the latter, then what is being done is at the expense of those already in residence.

### III. Reports of Committees

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

Silvernail announced three items.

1. Contested Elections. Based on a return of 455 ballots of

1,121 sent (41% return), Professors Geckle (ENGL) and Welsh (MEDC) were elected to Faculty Advisory Committee. Professors Marshall (GINT) and Lucas (NURS) to Honorary Degrees Committee. Professor Datta (PHYS) to Savannah River Review Committee.

2. May Meeting. The May meeting will be held after the General Faculty Meeting (3:00 p.m.) 3 May in the Law Auditorium.

3. Summer Meeting. Summer meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on 6 July at 3:00 p.m. in Currell College Auditorium.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Bledsoe, Chair:

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

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

Kuiper made an editorial addition on p. A-4, beneath b. Literature by adding 3 and 3 for the hours required. She then noted the committee was postponing, at the suggestion of Senate Steering Committee which was acceding to a request from the College of Science and Mathematics, consideration at this time of the following section from p. A-4, Laboratory Sciences, "and approved courses in Humanities and Social Sciences departments, e.g. GEOG 201, 202<sup>3</sup>." This item will be considered at the May meeting.

Professor Minghi (GEOG) wanted to know why the delay was requested - insufficient time?

Kuiper said yes that the College of Science and Mathematics had not had an opportunity to meet with the committee.

Dean Kay (HUSS) said a letter had been sent from her office to them on 16 February. She had received a reply this morning (5 April). She wishes to make sure there is adequate discussion on this matter between the two colleges.

Professor Lawrence (GEOL) questioned the meaning on p. A-3, Mathematics/Analytical Reasoning Section of "MATH 122/141, plus an additional course from Mathematics (at the next highest level)".

Professor Mercer said he believed that this was a grammatical error when the Senate passed core requirements and the intent was the next higher level. Following further discussion, Lawrence proposed the wording on p. A-3 be changed to read "at the next higher level".

Fellers ruled this to be a correctable item without a motion being necessary. In addition, MATH 122/141 was changed to MATH 122 or 141.



A discussion then followed over the change in the History requirement (p. A-3), particularly the part stating HIST 101 or 102. It was pointed out this was partly in response to a growing recognition of the importance of non-first world cultures.

Kuiper moved I., A. the ayes overwhelmed the nays. She then made an editorial correction on p. A-9, CHEM 334 - Prereq.: CHEM 334 to 333. She moved separately each roman numeral and lettered item. All, in their turn, were accepted.

D. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Becker, Chair:

Becker referred to the committee report pp. A 14-15. He spoke to both parts A and B and noted that the recommendation on faculty salary inequities implied a review not only of salary amounts but also such things as time in grade and length of service.

He said that in regard to the resolution on the State Health Plan problem, he had received a phone call from Senator Warren Giese assuring him (Becker) that the money taken from the Plan would be restored.

Mack asked if the lost interest would also be restored?

Becker said he did not know if it would be and did not feel we should expect too much in this area. He went on to say Professor Este's letter pointed out that there would be about \$16.5m in accumulated interest.

Fellers added he had heard from the Budget and Control Board that they would recommend restoring some \$48m to the Plan. This would mean much of the interest would also be involved.

Professor Coolidge (HIST) asked if the Provost would respond to the report of the committee on salaries? Provost Smith said much of what might be done next year depends on the salary increase package that will be made available. If it is 7 or 8 percent, we could do much, if it is the 4 percent passed by the House we will be able to do much less as there would be pressure to deal with merit only and not with historical inequities.

Weasmer asked who were the "rich" colleges?

Becker said Medicine, Law, Business Administration and Engineering. Science and Mathematics would be in the middle and Humanities and Social Sciences at the bottom.

A professor in the Law School noted that there are salary inequities in his school as well as in the other colleges.

E. Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee, Professor Brown, Chair:

Brown moved the committee recommendation - p. A-16 - to publish in the Undergraduate Bulletin, The General Education Requirements passed by Senate in 1986.

Professors Mercer and Holst (FORL) recommended the recently Senate approved clarification of the Foreign Languages section be editorially substituted for the present wording.

Fellers agreed this was acceptable.

Weasmer spoke against the committee recommendation as he believed it to be 1) unnecessary and 2) confusing. The Bulletin already refers students to the individual college listings which in some cases are more rigorous than the general university requirements.

Professors Mercer and Brown (JOUR) disagreed with Weasmer by pointing out that General Education Requirements (University) are to be found nowhere in print except the Faculty Senate Minutes.

There was no further discussion. The committee report with the editorial changes in Foreign Languages and Numerical and Analytical Reasoning (i.e. the next higher level) was accepted.

F. Athletic Advisory Committee, Professor Robinson, Chair:

Robinson reported on the new Athletic Recruitment Philosophy which the committee has reviewed and approved. Basically, athletes are to meet all University admission criteria. Special admission procedures are spelled out and maximum numbers to be involved are listed. A new Student-Athlete Appeals Committee will review each request. This committee will be made up of three persons, one must be a faculty member who has served on the Faculty Athletic Advisory Committee. This person will serve a three year term.

Robinson then spoke to the ticket distribution question referred earlier to the committee. They are ready to report to that part of the question which involved the away Clemson-USC football game. Of those allocated to the faculty-staff block, one-half will be based on seniority of holding tickets and one-half by lottery.

Fellers noted that the special admissions philosophy represented "real progress" in this area. He said he believed our Director of Athletics and Coach Woods have indicated academic progress is a high priority. He complemented Professor Robinson and the Faculty Athletic Advisory Committee on an outstanding job.

IV. Report of Secretary  
No Report.

V. Unfinished Business  
None.

IV. New Business  
None.

VII. Good of the Order

Professor Conant (MUSC) wanted to know if the Provisional Year Program was going to be cancelled?

Provost Smith said there was no intent to cancel the program, but it was being trimmed back. It appears that we are admitting a large number of out-of-state students in the program which has an annual cap of 250 students. These students do not help us in terms of reported statistics in the area of SAT scores and grade point averages of incoming freshman. We are trying to seal the size of the freshman class to 2,750 (down from this year's 3,000) to include 150 Provisional Year students.

VIII. Announcements

Conant asked the faculty to send him any concerns on safety so that he may bring them before the Safety Committee.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.