MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF APRIL 1, 1987

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 PM by Chairman David H. Rembert, Jr.

I. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

Secretary Silvernail corrected three typographical errors, p. M-4 --prospect, p. M-9--suggestion; p. M-11--Mary Ellen Kurucz. He then corrected p. M-10, paragraph 4 from "there was no further discussion and the amendment passed . . ." to "there was no further discussion and the motion passed . . .".

II. Reports of Officers.

President Holderman announced that The Report of the President 1977-86 was available and could be obtained at the close of the meeting. He then had distributed a one page handout (Attachment 2) entitled "Funding Comparison." The following items were emphasized in his comments on the handout.

1. From 1980-81 to the present, we have not received full formula funding.

2. Rounded off, we have a cumulative shortfall in formula funding of $69.5 million since 1980.

3. The formula is based on an average of 20 or so institutions. He compared receiving full formula funding with a grade of "C".

4. The EIA has taken up all of the projected growth in the state's economy, estimated to be 7 percent.

5. If a possible $9 million is added to the budget for all higher education we would obtain about $4 million of that increase. Yet, we would still be below the amount appropriated in 1986-87. It was pointed out that only education is targeted for budget increases in 1987-88.

6. Recently it would seem the climate for higher education in the state has not been favorable. The fact that the university budget from state appropriations has dropped from 70 percent to 48 percent and that the proportion of the state budget going to higher education has dropped from 19 percent to 12 or 13 percent supports this statement.
However, Governor Campbell in a speech in Charleston, stated that higher education must be included in the education priority. The governor further stated that we have been very foolish as a state for the last eight years by not having done so.

7. The impact of tuition increases appears on the handout and shows that the nearly $19 million added since 1980-81 reduces the shortfall to nearly $50.5 million.

The floor was opened for questions and/or comments.

Professor Datta (PHYS) noted the university budget is going down in terms of real money as well as in terms of percentage.

Professor Pauluzzi (FORL) noted that there had been tuition increases in six of the last seven years and inquired why there would be no tuition increase in 1987-88.

Holderman stated that it was felt tuition increases were often counter productive. If tuition increases are announced early, it may have the effect of the legislature appropriating less state money. If a tuition increase is announced after the appropriations are made, the students cry "foul" in that they were not notified in the spring. The announcement that there would be no tuition increase in 1987-88 was announced early in the hope the legislature would realize a shortfall would not be passed on to the students.

It is felt the students at this point in time can not carry any additional load with respect to tuition. However, if the legislature does not appropriate the necessary money next year, there "will have to be a whopping tuition increase."

Pauluzzi asked again if we could not explain our position to the taxpayers of South Carolina?

Holderman responded by naming a number of talks to service organizations, visits to every campus of the University system and with local commissions as well as legislative groups.

Professor Sederberg (GINT) asked for clarification of the tuition increase and its impact on the cumulative shortfall.

Holderman noted that the nearly $19 million in cumulative tuition increases would reduce the $69 million shortfall to about $50 million.

Datta (PHYS) asked if the President had considered leaving the University?

Holderman responded by noting that on certain mornings he had thought about it but by afternoon the feeling usually had passed.

Unidentified Senator inquired about what was said at the President's talk before a student group earlier in the week.
Holderman answered that he had been asked to speak some time ago to the Sigma Delta Pi honorary. He informed them he was under restriction from lawyers not to answer specific questions on subjects that are currently under litigation.

Professor Fellers (ENGR) asked if there would be any point in his writing the entire Richland County delegation.

Holderman said yes, it would be useful. He then pointed out that the Provost could use all help possible and that he was almost single handedly responsible for obtaining the $9 million added by the House for higher education.

Professor Millstone (FORL) noted that the newspaper had reported the city of Columbia had received a ranking of 40th in the nation as a growing area; the presence of the University being cited as one of the main reasons.

Holderman responded that the State Development Board is now using us more in the last two months than ever before. He felt they realize we do make a difference in attracting new industry. The new Engineering Center, the ongoing research base, the new cultural center, the University as a whole does make a positive impact.

Professor Tucker (SOCY) said he understood the need to make the legislature aware of our financial situation but cautioned about the possibility of "compromising our academic freedom" and that we should be careful about tradeoffs.

Holderman agreed, but said we would not be involved in tradeoffs but rather informing the legislature of our legitimate needs. He pointed out, as an example, the efforts of Professor Keith Davis in working with legislators on a one-to-one basis.

Provost Borkowski added that he too had many meetings and talks with groups concerning our financial needs and the resources of the University. He noted talks with Senators Thurmond and Hollings, the State Development Board, the Chamber of Commerce as well as service organizations.

Associate Provost Ackerman announced the new Faculty Manual was out and noted that a correction on page 29 would be made. A self-sticking sheet will be sent out with the correction so that the offending paragraph can be eliminated.

III. Reports of Committees.

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

Silvernail announced: 1) the Student Discipline document had been transmitted to the administration for implementation; 2) the
appointments of Professor David Cowart (ENGL) to the Student Organization Judicial Board and Professor David Lawrence (GEOL) to the Student Organization Judicial Appeal Board.

Silvernail, on behalf of the committee, placed in nomination the following for membership on the new Faculty Committee on Libraries.

Daniel Barron
Matthew Bruccoli
Benjamin Gimarc
John Herr
Charles Mack
Oliver Wood

The following names were placed in nomination from the floor.

Owen Connelly
James Keith
Ed Sharp
Rudy Jones
JoAnne Herman
William Nolte
Heidi Mills

Rembert stated a mailout ballot would go to the faculty within 5 days and must be returned to Faculty Senate Office within the following 10 days.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Sharp, Chairman:

Sharp moved acceptance of the committee report. There was no discussion and the report was accepted by voice vote.

C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor Maggiotto, Chairman:

Maggiotto noted several typographical errors and corrected p. A-24, MATH 111 to read development in algebraic methods. He then moved I and II. There being no discussion, these were accepted by voice vote. He then moved acceptance of III, section A. This was accepted by voice vote.

Maggiotto then moved the Department of Foreign Languages curriculum revision, page A-5 through page A-22.

Professor Felix (LAWS) pointed out that on page A-8, in the explanatory footnote, CHIN 102, would need to be renumbered.

Maggiotto corrected this to CHIN 122. Following some clarification the curriculum revision was accepted.
Maggiotto then moved III. Section B. With no discussion, this was accepted. Part IV was moved and accepted. Part V, an amendment to the Core Curriculum to modify the Numerical and Analytical Reasoning component, was moved.

Professor Costa (PHIL) while supporting the restructuring of the mathematics curriculum, spoke against the amendment on the basis that the requirement should be as general and flexible as possible. He then proposed the following substitute amendment:

B) NUMERICAL AND ANALYTICAL REASONING--six credits to be earned in one of the following ways: a course from Mathematics at the level of 120 or higher plus an additional course from Philosophy 110, 111, Mathematics above the level of 120, Computer Science or Statistics; two courses from one of the following fields--Philosophy (110 and 111 only) OR Computer Science OR Statistics.

Professor Bennett (MATH) reminded the Senate of the discussion about the Core Curriculum last year and noted that the State of Louisiana has passed a nine hour mathematical sciences requirements--six hours of mathematics and statistics and three hours of computer literacy for all students. He also noted that the original Lightsey Commission Report recommended a three hour mathematics requirement for all students in the university system. He warned of further weakening of already weak curriculum requirements if we are to become a great university.

The original amended proposal passed last year caused so much dissent around campus that today’s proposed rewording was submitted. He then summed up his statement by speaking against the substitute amendment. He felt the Curricula and Courses Committee had given considerable thought to the original proposed amendment.

Dean Kay (HUSS) noted that her college and the College of Science and Mathematics have a joint panel to evaluate the entire undergraduate experience. Part of the panel’s mandate includes evaluating the core curriculum. She spoke against changing at this time the curriculum passed last year. She suggested that it would be worthwhile to hear the report of the joint panel before making changes.

Rembert reminded the Senate the core curriculum would not be implemented until the fall of 1988.

Associate Dean Compton (HUSS) inquired if funds had been allocated for the proposal--such as staffing a required MATH 120 course?

Maggiotto said it was his understanding that there could be a strain on the Math Department budget. Perhaps similar to the strain on the English Department’s budget in offering enough sections of 100 level English.

Bennett said it will cost money to implement a program such as this. The resources will have to be provided.
Sederberg noted potential impacts on other programs such as Philosophy-Logic. He further noted the Lightsey Commission Report, in his opinion, showed little serious philosophy concerning undergraduate education. He emphasized the diversity of the university and felt that requirements are more appropriately addressed at the college level especially if they take to heart the mandate to increase the rigor of the requirements.

Professor Long (PHIL) asked if the Curricula and Courses Committee would explain why they felt the change in section B was necessary.

Maggiotto responded saying the committee felt that students would be illiterate if they went without at least three hours of mathematics. The committee was persuaded of the linguistic nature of mathematics for the sciences.

Rembert restated the substitute motion.

Professor Weasmer (GINT) stated that for the record the motion is to strike out and insert.

The substitute motion was defeated by voice vote.

Rembert then stated the floor was again open for action on the original motion. Additional discussion took place. The question was called and passed. By voice vote the proposed change was defeated.

D. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Altekruse, Chairwoman:

Altekruse reviewed the committee proposal to establish a faculty budget committee including the charge from Faculty Steering Committee to look into ways in which the faculty could have more direct influence on governance relative to fiscal matters within the academic sector. She then recommended the proposal for acceptance with an editorial change in the footnote to read "elected prior to the final meeting."

Pauluzzi questioned the current Advisory Committee membership, the objectives of the committee, and the committee's standard duties.

Altekruse quoted the Faculty Manual in answer to the questions.

Pauluzzi further stated that he felt the membership of the proposed budget committee, even with the addition of three members to the Advisory Committee base, was "closed."

Altekruse responded that she saw the Advisory Committee as one of the most "open" committees in the University in terms of faculty representation. She went on to explain the rationale of the role of the Advisory Committee in the budget consideration. She also reviewed alternate solutions rejected in committee.
Sederberg inquired if this action would not add extensively to the duties of the Advisory Committee?

Altekruse responded with a "yes," but the membership would be willing to take on the additional work.

Sederberg then raised the substantive issue of the potential of "co-op" of Faculty in a budgetary process over which they will ultimately have little influence or impact. Based on his previous experience along these lines, he felt that the information received was incomplete and macro. He then asked if after the committee's investigations they had any reason to have a high degree of confidence that the participation of the proposed committee would have anything other than a veneer of legitimacy?

Altekruse said the committee had similar fears and some of the same past experiences. She noted the objectives of the proposed committee and then summarized them in the term "that is to establish the rationale of what is going on in decision making by the University administration." This includes the functions of communication, consultation, and influence. She also stated the document was a kind of constitutional underpinning rather than a statutory arrangement.

Pauluzzi felt there was a lack of balance in the proposed committee membership. He sees the main elements in the objectives to be "faculty perspective, fiscal decisions, and academic progress." He equated these objectives as perhaps a committee membership of three from the area of academic planning, three for the fiscal from the area of faculty welfare and three from the area of advisory for faculty perspective.

Professor Sproat (HIST) stated he felt the framework proposed was well thought out. He warned the results of the proposed committee would depend upon the faculty as a whole.

Tucker (SOCY) noted there is faculty skepticism about the effect of the proposed procedure. However, he saw two tracks available: 1) get involved in the budgetary process, make our positions known, state what we want said, and question the proposed committee chairman, or 2) continue to harp about the fact that the faculty has no input. He summed up his feelings by strongly recommending the proposal.

Felix (LAWS) speaking from a wealth of past experience, felt the proposal was structurally sound and that the proposed committee membership would be equal to the task.

Professor Quinn (NURS) questioned the term "the body" and did this mean the administration would no longer deal in those matters with the faculty as a whole?
Altekruse responded by saying it was felt that the fact the proposed committee would report on a regular basis to the Faculty Senate would not negate the administration's dealing with the faculty as a whole.

The question was called, seconded and approved. The Faculty Advisory Committee report was then approved by voice vote.

IV. Report of Secretary.

Silvernail reported that as instructed (March 4 meeting), the tapes of the February meeting were reviewed and the minutes of that meeting will be corrected to reflect that (page M-4): "Pauluzzi moved that there be a committee formed to study the matter of the University budget. He recommended it be chaired by Professor Howard-Hill."

Silvernail then reported the May meeting of Faculty Senate will be on Tuesday, 5 May immediately following the 3:00 PM General Faculty meeting. The meeting place will be the Law Auditorium.

V. Unfinished Business.

None.

VI. New Business.

Professor Coolidge (HIST) referred the Senate to page A-32 of the agenda and moved the following motion, published on that page, that: "The action taken by the Faculty Senate at its meeting on March 4, 1987 in regard to paragraph VII on page A-25 [of that meeting] of the agenda be rescinded."

Coolidge then spoke to the motion emphasizing that he felt the actions by a "thin Senate late in a long meeting may not have reflected the views of the Senate as a whole."

Following considerable discussion, little of which was substantive in nature, the question was called for, seconded, and passed. The motion to rescind was approved by voice vote. Thus, Part C of the Core Curriculum again reads: "Humanities and Social Sciences, 12 credits, at least three of which must be in history and three in Fine Arts."

Rembert asked for further nominations to the new Library Committee. There were none and he closed the nomination process. A ballot will be distributed to the faculty.
VII. Good of the Order.

Professor Becker (HIST) read the following statement into the minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the March meeting I inquired of the Provost whether it was correct that whereas some college are not renewing first-year appointments in response to the fiscal crunch, others are still hiring. The Provost responded that he had left such decisions to the academic units.

I am concerned about this approach and would like to suggest to the Provost that the non-renewal of first-year faculty be reconsidered. The matter has several aspects which bear on it.

First, there is the faculty member concerned. A beginning faculty member is on probation and can be cancelled. But the term probation, I think, can safely be understood to refer to the conduct of the professor and not automatically to the temporary insolvency of the institution. Secondly, the professor in question joined this institution in good faith, perhaps involving a personal expense, and not to renew a contract should not be one of the first steps to deal with a budget crisis. The effect on the morale of the terminated professor needs no elaboration, but the impression that this institutional reaction makes on others in the department or college certainly is destructive as well. Does that make sense?

Secondly there is the unit which hired the professor. Presumably some considered judgment went into the decision to hire someone in the first place. A search committee was formed, national advertisements were placed, applications were sifted, the leading applicants were brought to the campus, and finally one was hired. All of this effort and expense for naught. Also presumably, as soon as better times roll around again, the unit will repeat the same procedure. Does that make sense?

Thirdly there is the university itself. For years we have been proclaiming that we are getting better and better every day. Are we now willing to let the academic world know—and rest assured, word will get around quickly—that we have to terminate first-year people? Does that make sense?

I know that the Provost wants the colleges to be as autonomous as possible, and I applaud him for that. Decentralized governance on the whole is better than too much
centralization. The problem is that the individual college by necessity looks only at its own problems and its solu-
tions are determined by its own self-interest, not that of the institution as a whole. Colleges have different means at their disposal, different numbers of vacancies through the non-filling of which savings can be effected. Only the top administration has the overview over what is happening and is in a position to prevent inequities.

The non-renewal of faculty members should only be an act of last resort, after all other less drastic means of solving the problem have been exhausted. I am not convinced that this has been done, as long as we continue to hire people. There may be clear emergencies where this is unavoidable, but I am not convinced of that either as long as we have a college which is offering a position to an ABD to teach one graduate course per semester at a salary of $35,000. Such inequities should not be permitted in a well-managed institution. Faculty members should not be so many pieces of equipment which can be acquired and discarded at will.

For all of these reasons I urge the Provost to reconsider his policy and to exercise the controls with which his position provides him.

VIII. Announcements.

Felix (LAWS) announced the South Carolina Fulbright Association is hoping to have a workshop in late April of early May to provide information and discussion concerning Fulbright appointments.

Tucker (SOCY) announced that the South Carolina chapter of the AAUP will have its conference on 4 April. Dr. Jan Kemp will speak in the morning and a panel discussion will be held in the afternoon.

Professor Mosher (FORL) announced Dr. Rose Hayden will speak in Gambrell Hall on Friday evening 10 April.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:13 PM.