

MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING, February 3, 1988

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by Chairman Rufus G. Fellers. The agenda was modified to allow Reports of Officers to be the first order of business.

I. Reports of Officers.

FELLERS introduced the President-elect of the University of South Florida, Provost Frank Borkowski. PROVOST BORKOWSKI made the following statement, here recorded in its entire form:

Normally I speak to you extemporaneously; but not trusting myself this time to convey my true feelings extemporaneously, I thought it would be prudent to try to express them in writing.

My good friends, as the years go by, the strength of friendships increases, almost imperceptibly, and, until a time like this one does not internalize fully the depth of appreciation for closeness that develops among friends and colleagues. I find that only now am I fully aware of how much I have drawn upon your strength and of the fact that what I have achieved has only been possible through the accomplishments and strength of those with whom I have worked in our excellent system of governance for so long. Over the past few hectic weeks, this moment has never been far from my mind. I will not be maudlin, nor do I want to be distant, but to somehow sum up my feelings in a few words...and certainly not go on at great length. It had even occurred to me that I might take advantage of the Christmas break and the lack of a January Senate meeting and slip away without standing before you again, but I couldn't bring myself to do it nor did I really wish to. Therefore, let me share with you...I understand that I've achieved some little notoriety for a tendency to do this with people...let me share with you a few thoughts. Sharing may well be the appropriate word here, for I doubt that I will actually tell you very much that you don't already know.

Carolina has established a national and international reputation in many fields. It is a great university rich in history and tradition, and it is a growing univeristy. You have a dynamic president in James Holderman and with him you have realized incredible achievements in the last decade. But, and

the President shares this view with me, the foundation was here and what has been achieved in the past ten years could not have been accomplished without the outstanding work of all of those whom you represent in this body, the Faculty Senate. From the maturity and strength of the old guard to the exciting vitality of the young turks, this faculty, by its own efforts and by its concentrated and consistent work over the years has brought the name of Carolina to its current prominence...and, about this I have no doubts: the University of South Carolina because of your presence, will rise in the 1990's to even greater heights.

You are the University of South Carolina. Whatever is accomplished here is your accomplishment and yours alone. You show your strength in the classroom, in the library, and in the laboratory. You bring lustre to this institution in the late hours of the night or early morning as you polish an article or correct a proof or advise a student in academic trouble or serve on a committee that meets at 7:30 on a week night. We have not always been able to reward you to the extent that we would wish or that you deserve. We have not always been able to provide you with the best resources which are so important to your work. But you have been tenacious; you have been loyal; and you have been successful; and in that success, you have made the name of the University of South Carolina respected throughout the academic world. I am optimistic about the future for Carolina and that optimism is grounded completely in the talent, professionalism and capacity of this great faculty.

As did many of you, I came here an outsider, and I came with a last name that still jars the sensibilities of some of those who are genuinely native and to the manner born. But I was already well aware of the academic strength of this university and I was proud to be selected to work with you and to be accepted as a member of this faculty. Now as I leave you I feel a particular pleasure because I am one of you. Kay and I have struck deep roots here. Our children reached maturity in South Carolina. We will settle into a new home and learn the ways of another university, but this will always be home.

My good colleagues, my greatest pleasure has been and will continue to be my association with you. This has been an exciting and humbling experience. Whatever happens in the future, I will always take pleasure in recalling our association and take great pride in

watching your achievements. Finally, let me underscore my admiration for your sense of academic community, for the strength and professionalism of your faculty organizations, for the individual and collective responsibility that you feel and express for this institution. Do not lose that sense of shared governance...if you do, Carolina will be the poorer.

I must say that I look forward to the challenges of a new position. I am proud to have been selected to lead and serve a young and growing university, the University of South Florida. But let me tell you in all candor that but for the strength and accomplishments of this faculty, this position which I have now accepted would never have been opened to me. You have been a major source not only of strength but of comfort. You have given me strong and lasting friendships. I am reminded of a few sentences from my first address to you on September 6, 1978:

As you walk across the Horsehoe, I said then you know that this University has been here for a long time and will be here long after you and I are gone from the scene. The company of those who went before surrounds us each day. I am confident that the years ahead will be exciting and rewarding for all of us.

I still firmly believe that. I can say no more than thank you from my heart for the privilege of having been one of this faculty community. God bless you.

FELLERS announced that a reception would be held for the Provost at 4:00 p.m. in McKissick Museum. He also announced the call for nominations for committees and noted these nominations should be in Faculty Senate Office by 11 February. At that time Faculty Steering Committee will meet to compile the slate of nominees. He then turned the meeting over to President James Holderman for a continuation of the Report of Officers.

PRESIDENT HOLDERMAN noted the large attendance and recommended to the chair that consideration of a January meeting date might be in order. He then reported on five items.

1. Replacement for Provost Borkowski - The head of the search committee, Dean Humphries of the Medical School, was in attendance and available to answer questions. He announced that Chairman Fellers and Professor Jim Knight, chair of Faculty Advisory Committee, were members of the search committee and that Faculty Senate Steering Committee would have the opportunity to review (in confidence) the credentials of the candidates and to interview candidates when they come to campus.

2. Ecumenical Institute - Contrary to media reports, an Ecumenical Institute has not been established. Discussion and deliberation is on-going. He repeated that he would bring the committee report to Faculty Senate for discussion, not for approval or action, before any final decision is made.

3. Faculty salaries - Some progress is being made on a request for an additional \$5.2 million for salaries for the entire system of colleges and universities. "We are enthusiastic about that progress and hopeful it can be taken care of in this fiscal year, but if not we are plugged in." This additional money would bring the averages to at least the southeastern averages.

4. Savannah River Plant - Reports of our activity with SRP have been exaggerated with respect to their finality. We have been asked by two other universities to consider a consortial arrangement and we are doing that. The Request for Proposals from Department of Energy will not come out until the middle of this month and it will be May before a contractor is selected to manage the entire Savannah River Project. "Whether or not there is a place for the university consortium is a matter which remains to be seen and there will be fora [plural of forum] on this subject with faculty opportunity for involvement before the University makes any determination." We are a long way from any involvement except in conversations with Clemson University and MUSC and prospective contractors.

5. State Ethics Commission letter - The President handed out (see attachment #1) a copy of a letter from the State Ethics Commission to Mr. Paul J. Ward, University Counsel. The letter notes the Commission is considering a proposal which would severely limit outside compensation. The deadline to respond to the letter is 29 February. The President then opened the meeting to questions.

DATTA (PHYS) asked what kind of SRP arrangements might be made?

HOLDERMAN said he did not know until a principal contractor was identified. He did not feel we would be the ultimate manager of the laboratory as that would probably go to a private corporation nor would we wish to be in that position.

COSTA (PHIL) read a proposal regarding our possible involvement in SRP as he wished to learn the President's feelings about the proposal. "The Faculty Senate urges on the administration to exercise extreme caution in considering formal association with the Savannah River Plant and to this end request that the administration appropriate funds for a public discussion of the pros and cons of such a relationship giving the Faculty Advisory Committee the responsibility of organizing such discussion."

HOLDERMAN felt this was not necessary as he had said he would do everything asked in the proposal. SEDERBERG (GINT) made the comment that funds were being requested to bring in outside people with expertise in the area. He went on to note three points of concern moving from the concrete to the philosophical.

1. DuPont Corporation is leaving its relationship to SRP for practical reasons.

2. The relationship of the educational and research mission of the University and the availability of the classified research facility.

3. The philosophical question of the problem of classified research and free and ultimate conduct of inquiry. He went on to amplify on his statement "I think secrecy of any kind is a problem for the scientific community."

HOLDERMAN responded that the question now is to decide how the options and prospects may be reviewed by whatever group(s) wishes to review them. He will confer with the Chair and Faculty Advisory Committee to consider the appropriate format.

PROFESSOR AVIGNONE (PHYS) explained that the SRP and SRL are different entities. He said he had worked at SRL and everything was published in the open literature even though the site at which the work was done was classified.

Following additional discussion, the President restated that no commitments to anyone had been made. However, we need to understand what options might be available.

HOWARD-HILL (ENGL) asked the President, in light of his December statement, what progress had been made on the review provision concerning faculty salaries.

HOLDERMAN stated that we had been working hard on the acquisition of additional monies for this fiscal year but that we have not done much on the review process. He will report further on this at the March meeting.

PROFESSOR MACK (ART) referred to a memo of 14 January 1988 from Vice-President Denton's office regarding foreign travel approval procedures.

HOLDERMAN interjected that this was not a new policy but was in place when he arrived. MACK responded that old or new, he was concerned that the policy seemed on the surface: 1) to run contrary to freedom of travel; 2) "contrary to English Common LAW"; 3) and was an invasion of privacy.

HOLDERMAN said he did not know if we ever had such a travel request turned down, but he would find out the history behind the policy.

PROFESSOR DURIG (CHEM) gave brief background of what led to the policy formulation.

MACK felt the issue should be looked at, including the legal basis. HOLDERMAN agreed to do this.

HOLDERMAN then referred to the Provost search process. He noted he had no particular candidate in mind, but has asked the committee to bring some names to him by late spring. He would like to have somebody in place by the beginning of the next academic year.

FELLERS noted the foreign travel question had been raised at Faculty Steering Committee as well. Faculty Welfare Committee will look into this matter.

ACTING PROVOST BAIN noted that every ten years we go through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Reaffirmation [reaccreditation] Provision. While this will not take place until 1990, criteria has changed significantly and we are getting an early start. Professor Ashley (JOUR) will chair the Columbia campus Steering Committee. He will be assisted by Professor Bell (SCCC).

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

SECRETARY SILVERNAIL corrected the minutes by adding to page M-2, first paragraph, following the first sentence, a sentence which reads....He said he thought that the review provisions would be undertaken expeditiously and gave assurance this would be done. The minutes were approved as corrected.

III. Reports of Committees.

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

SILVERNAIL reminded the body to send their recommendations for nomination to committee posts to the Faculty Senate Office by 11 February.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Beamer, Chair:

BEAMER moved the committee report and it was accepted.

C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor Brown, Chair:

BROWN announced the committee has finished the Guidelines, to be used when material is submitted to the committee, and sent them to all deans and departments. He thanked the offices of the Provost and the Registrar for their help.

A request had been received via the Provost from the University Campus System asking for clarification concerning the new general education requirements. He read the following statement as a part of the committee's response.

It is not really possible to provide specific answers to many of your questions. The prime reason is that each college of the university has a considerable amount of autonomy in setting graduation requirements above the University minimum. By the same token each college may determine what courses are remedial, which are considered fine arts, whether geography courses are considered as natural science, what language courses are not allowed and so on. In other words while the general requirements apply to all colleges the specific implementation is determined by the college awarding the degree.

BROWN then proceeded to the committee report. He handed out a list of editorial changes as well as an addendum of new courses and an experimental course. The new courses included BIOL 112L, 113L, 301L, 302L and CSCI 587. The experimental course is SMED 542X. He then moved Part I, College of Business Administration, with the editorial change of BADM 300(3) to BADM 300 (1) on p. A-9.

PROFESSOR McNULTY (MATH) wanted to know what would appear in the catalog under the heading "Numerical and Analytical Reasoning" (P. A-7) as this was incomplete.

BROWN explained the Senate was being asked to approve all the changes in the curriculum on the floor except the numerical section. This section would have to be approved at a later date - after the college had submitted it and the committee had reported it out. By handling the proposed curriculum changes in this manner, it was felt the college advisors could be doing their job as new students entered.

PROFESSOR HELTERMAN (ENGL) raised the question of the equivalence of BADM 380 to ENGL 463. Following lengthy and somewhat warm discussion, he moved to withdraw item 4. Communications from the committee report. Following additional discussion on the merits of the withdrawal motion, a vote was taken and the withdrawal motion was defeated.

Discussion returned to the original motion. PROFESSOR BENNETT (MATH) asked what would happen if the Senate does not act or refuses to accept the forthcoming numerical section?

BROWN responded with the statement that nothing would change in the catalog until all the requirements had been met and approved.

MACK moved the entire college package be returned to committee until it was complete. More discussion (5 pages of typescript) ensued and the motion to return was defeated.

FELLERS then called for a vote on Part I. The Senate accepted this part.

BROWN moved Part II. It was approved.

BROWN moved Part III. A.

PROFESSOR CASTLES (ENGL) pointed out that some of the numbered English courses (p. A-10) were incorrect as they were no longer in the catalog. By consent the revised courses would be ENGL 282, 284, 286, 297, 289, and 290.

McNULTY pointed out an inconsistency in the handout version of the BFA in Education dealing with Mathematics 111.* BROWN added the Foreign Language requirement was also incorrect. He then made a clarification statement that the motion on Part III.A. included item 1. on p. A-10 of the report and items 2. and 3. p. A-10 of the handout. The vote was called and the Part III.A. was accepted.

BROWN moved Part III.B. with the deletion of the last sentences on both FREN 209 and FREN 210.

PROFESSOR WEASMER (GINT) asked for an explanation of the description of SPAN 499. PROFESSOR MERCER (CHEM) raised the question of pass-fail grading. As no one from the Spanish section was in attendance to answer the questions, BROWN withdrew SPAN 499.

The modified Part III. B. motion was accepted. BROWN moved Part III. D. with the editorial changes in the last paragraph of (second sentence) expected, to, required and (fourth sentence) in that, to, at the 200 level. The modified motion was accepted.

BROWN moved Part IV. It was accepted.

BROWN moved Part V and the handout Part II. with the editorial change on p. A-13, in Group II - Quantitative, from or the sequence to or three courses including both; on p. A-14, under Biology item 1., paragraph 1, delete MATH 115 and the phrase MATH 111 or 115, together with; same page, item 2, delete extra "including". Part V was accepted as modified.

D. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Trevor Howard-Hill,
Chair:

HOWARD-HILL noted the committee report which was initiated under the chairmanship of Professor Burkhard (LAW) and designed and written by Professor Fraser (CRJU).

PROFESSOR CONANT (MUSC) noted the report took a great deal of work and the committee should be commended. FELLERS so ordered.

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

FRANKLIN recommended approval of the report.

SAFKO asked why the report did not come from Curriculum and Courses Committee?

BROWN responded that the committee had approved identical wording for the College of Science and Mathematics and the two committees involved agreed to have the reporting committee submit. The report was accepted.

F. Bookstore Committee, Professor Castner, Chair:

CASTNER explained the background to the proposed recommendation submitted as a handout. (See Attachment 2). She asked if a Senator would move the recommendation. PROFESSOR THESING (ENGL) moved the recommendation; there was a second. Discussion ensued concerning the ten day deadline for this semester.

SAFKO moved to return the recommendation to committee. The motion to recommit was sustained.

IV. Report of Secretary.
None.

V. Old Business.

SILVERNAIL, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, brought back the recommendation to enlarge the membership of the Faculty Library Committee. The recommendation was modified to read: "That the Committee on Libraries membership be enlarged to seven elected members including a member of the teaching faculty of the University Campuses and this member will be elected by the University Campus Senate."

PROFESSOR HERR (BIOL) and PROFESSOR BARRETT (Sumter) supported the recommendation. The recommendation was accepted by voice vote.

VI. New Business.

PROFESSOR KIRK (EDUC) moved that the Faculty Senate go on record opposing the proposal outlined in the State Ethics Commission letter.

FELLERS ruled this would be a substantive motion to be taken up at the next meeting. However, it was pointed out by Kirk that the deadline for response would be before the March meeting.

SAFKO and WEASMER combined forces to propose a "sense of the Senate" statement of opposition to the proposal and refer that to Senate Steering Committee to take appropriate action. The Senate agreed to this without verbal opposition.

VII. Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR SMITH (HIST) asked Professor Davis (PSYC), Chair of the Faculty Budget Committee, if the committee had found the University budget?

DAVIS said it had been found!

VIII. Announcements.

PROFESSOR PETERS (ENGR) announced a talk by President-emeritus (Pennsylvania State University) Eric Walker would be given on 23 February.

It was also announced that Mr. Theodore Taylor, Deputy Director of the Nuclear Agency, would speak at 8 p.m., 11 February.

There was no further business and the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.