The meeting was called to order at 3:06 PM by Chairman David H. Rembert, Jr.

I. Approval of Minutes.

With a typographical correction, the minutes were approved.

II. Reports of Officers.

Provost Borkowski commented on three issues.

1. The administration is working on the budget reduction problem. Approximately $2.6 million has been taken from the University. The Faculty Advisory Committee is being involved in the budgetary work. At this time there is no fixed amount to be taken from the academic area as all of the various reserves of the institution are being reviewed. The current budget is available for viewing in the Faculty Senate Office.

2. The situation concerning the "R" accounts was reviewed. All of the University expenditures have been opened to the press with one exception, approved by unanimous Board of Trustee action.

3. The Commission on Higher Education is planning to take action on the report of the AVA consulting group and the staff recommendations to the report. The Provost will work with his colleague from Clemson University to have any firm action postponed until January so that we would have time to study the recommendations. It is felt these recommendations have serious implications for institutional governance in such areas as admission policies and evaluations.

Professor Sproat (HIST) felt that it might be better to have all the discretionary fund expenditures opened for inspection.

Provost stated that the point was well taken as no one relishes the accompanying publicity. However, he felt complete disclosure would alienate the people who have or might support the University in the area of private funding. He noted that
other institutions have discretionary funds in foundations and
do not use income generated on campus. Some institutions take
generated income and transfer it to foundations, which we appar­
etly can do in this state, but have not done so, and thus have
protected the issue of discretion.

Professor Pauluzzi (FORL) inquired about academic programs
and the required cost cutting to the budget.

Provost reviewed the state mandated budget cut and again
emphasized that he will keep the Faculty Advisory Committee fully
informed and seek their advice and recommendations as he moves
into the academic portion of the cut. He does not envision
terminating programs.

Professor Coolidge (HIST) expressed his concern about the
proposed actions of the CHE and inquired if the Senate could
learn the names, academic qualifications and experience of the
CHE staff.

Provost stated he would identify the staff and their quali­
fications and noted he would be happy to have interested persons
contact any of them to express feelings and concerns.

Professor Mack (ARTH) expressed his concern over the impact
of the information published that the average professor's salary
was $52,000 to $54,000. He also wanted to know how the figures
were developed.

President Holderman responded that the figures were obtained
by adding the salaries together and dividing by the number of
people included. He felt the publishing of these figures would
not have an impact on our efforts to raise faculty salaries. He
then also reviewed the situation of the R200 account. He repeated
again the progress made in obtaining private funds for scholar­
ships and research professorships.

Professor Fellers (ENGR) inquired if the salary figures pub­
lished included all full professors at the University.

President stated yes.

Professor Safko (ASTR) wanted to know if the figures were
based on nine months or total compensation?

President said it was nine months but the 15 percent summer
compensation was also noted.

Pauluzzi (FORL) stated that he felt the administration should
crease publishing average salaries and instead point out the facts
submitted by Professor Becker at the last meeting.
President responded that he would like to know what could be done about faculty salaries that was not already being done. For example, the General Assembly is already talking about a salary increase of 3 percent to start in January of 1988, even before the University has been to the Legislature. He stated we will speak against this and added we will probably speak out alone. He is hopeful that the percentage will be raised and that it will be implemented earlier in the academic year.

Mack (ARTH) repeated he felt there could be a public relations problem, particularly since Madame Sadat's salary was published.

President again repeated that the administration will do everything they can do to improve faculty salaries and that the salary issue should be addressed to the Legislators as well as to him.

Professor Becker (HIST) spoke to the inequality of entry level salaries among different units of the University and then noted that these inequalities seem to grow as "the people labor in the vineyard." He then asked "whether there is not something that can be done within the University budget and internally to adjust these low salaries?"

Provost responded that with the Faculty Advisory Committee it is the intention to look at the issue of equity within the areas themselves. He added "clearly there must be some response to the market place that has to be considered, but we all go to the same grocery store . . . . ."

President added that we spend more on salaries and put more into the salary budget than is allocated by state appropriation. The amount mandated is usually only funded at 70 percent and the University must make up the difference, often through additional fees. He was hopeful the new state administration would recognize the need for major salary increases.

Dean Kay (HUSS) stated that the College of Humanities and Social Sciences was currently working on a salary study comparing college salaries with those of comparative schools in the Southeast.

Provost requested that he receive the report by the end of January.

Professor Stephens (JOUR) noted he would like to know what units of the University have salaries at the national average.

President noted that in nine years the whole of the faculty has never been brought up to the national average.

Professor French (RELG) inquired if statistics were available that would clarify whether or not salary inequities have increased in the past ten years?
President did not know the answer to the question, but would look into getting the information.

Dean Waugh (ENGR) commented that every year formula funding percentage is the same for every state institution of higher education. He stated further that the President does not have the discretion of giving greater amounts than mandated particularly so in that the mandated amount is only partly funded. He also noted that in engineering they must hire at market place costs or not hire at all but that raises were at the whim of the legislature.

Pauluzzi (FORL) stated his hunch that "the legislature expects information from the University to come from the President's office and not from us. They are not going to listen to us, they are going to listen to the person who speaks for the University."

President emphatically replied that they had done that and a lot more with the legislature. For at least the past seven years they have been told about the faculty salary dilemma. He felt the point was not that the case has not been made, but that higher education has not been a high priority.

Waugh (ENGR) stated he has been with the President when he has asked the Budget and Control Board for special salary appropriations. He felt that our case had been made but not acted upon.

Provost and President detailed the latest specific attempts to enlighten the legislature about our needs and the value of the University of South Carolina to the State.

Pauluzzi (FORL) wished to know if money were given to the University for salary funds would the President guarantee they would be used "to right the imbalance of below-average salary professors?"

President responded by stating that if such money became available "it would be used to try to achieve that sense of equitability within the market place that has been discussed here today."

Provost asked that any recommendations as to how this could be handled (Pauluzzi's question), should it occur, be passed on to Faculty Advisory Committee. There were no further questions to the President or the Provost.

Dean Brewer (STUDENT AFFAIRS) called the Senate's attention to the handout "Alcohol Policy and Guidelines." He noted this would be mailed to all faculty and administrators.
III. Reports of Committees.

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

Silvernail placed the name of Professor Eddie Gaffney (PRSC) in nomination to fill the unexpired term (one semester) of Professor Marcucci on Student Affairs Committee.

Rembert called for additional nominations, there were none, and then declared nominations would be held open to the end of the meeting.

Silvernail brought back to the Senate the recommendation by committee that the Provisional Year be established as an approved program in the College of Applied Professional Sciences.

Rembert called for discussion of the recommendation, there being none he called for the vote. By voice vote the recommendation was approved as distributed.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Sharp, Chairman:

Sharp moved the committee report. The report was approved as distributed.

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

Maggiootto reminded the Senate that the handout concerning PSYC 380X, Sport Psychology (3) was an experimental course and was for the information of the Senate. He announced several editorial changes: IV. D. History 504, change Principate to Principate; VI. DPHR 654 to PHAR 654. He then moved approval of the committee report by separate Roman numeral, I. through VII. Each section was approved. Maggiootto moved the committee recommendation that implementation of the core curriculum be deferred until the Fall 1988 (item VIII).

Safko (ASTR) stated his opposition to the idea of a delay. He asked what were the difficulties that the committee foresaw?

Maggiootto answered that thus far no college has submitted a proposal to committee which would allow compliance with the Senate approved motion of May 1986. The committee felt that without the delay then the core curriculum could not be implemented.

Safko (ASTR) responded that it might be considered the opposite in that the Senate has mandated and then refused to implement.

Maggiootto disagreed and noted that the Council of Assistant and Associate Deans was working toward implementation. He emphasized this was not an easy or simple task.
Dean Kay (HUSS) stated that she felt the core curriculum should be a part of a wider college study and that she and the college faculty need more time to work things through.

Professor Carlsson (BADM) noted that some parts of the curricula change will be in place before the other parts fit. He asked how the requirement that a student show the equivalent of two years of foreign language study in the high school will be measured and how it will be handled if such equivalence is not demonstrated?

Maggiotto responded that the Department of Foreign Languages is currently working on this problem and that their response will be made to Courses and Curricula Committee. It is possible this item will be brought to the Senate in February or March. He reminded the Senate that the foreign language requirement was to be implemented by Fall 1988.

Professor Conant (MUSC) stated he felt the recommendation should have been noted separately to draw attention to it. He also stated he "assumed that this is not a ruse to try to change the core curriculum."

Maggiotto responded with an "absolutely not." By voice vote, the recommendation to delay implementation until the Fall 1988 was passed.

D. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Altekruse, Chairwoman:

Altekruse brought to the Senate's attention three on-going items involving committee's activity.

1. The CHE staff proposals relating to the AVA recommendations, particularly in the areas of procedures and criteria for student recruitment, admissions, and assessment have been reviewed by both Faculty Advisory and Admissions Committees. She then referred the Senate to a handout which contained the following resolution developed by the two committees.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT we therefore request the University administration's representatives to express our strongest concerns for the continuation of these respected faculty responsibilities and privileges and express our strongest and gravest objections to any efforts on the part of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education to have any external bodies determine standards for admission of, retention of, and assessment of the people of South Carolina, and other states and countries, who may wish to attend the University of South Carolina.
She also emphasized that the CHE would be meeting the next day and the committee would like to be able to have the Provost in receipt of the resolution, if passed, before that meeting. She then moved the resolution.

**Professor Berman (PRSC),** as chairman of Admissions Committee, spoke out strongly in favor of the resolution.

**Carlsson (BADM)** moved the question, which was passed. The resolution was then approved by unanimous voice vote.

2. The situation regarding the up-dated Faculty Manual was explained. The up-date will include policy items which have been approved since the last manual, editorial changes—including gender references, and factual changes such as dates and telephone numbers. She then moved approval of the revised Faculty Manual. The motion passed with no discussion.

3. The role of the Faculty Advisory Committee and its charge relative to financial governance of the institution and ways to show a continuous active faculty involvement in the governance process was explained. Three points were emphasized:

   a) The development of a mechanism which will sustain faculty involvement in the financial governance process. This would include a design that will allow for faculty influence and involvement in a participative way as the financial options for the University are being developed.

   b) The designation of the body in which this responsibility will be vested.

   c) Establishment of periodic and prescribed reporting to the Faculty Senate.

Meetings and talks with the administration are taking place as well as some input from faculty has been received on these matters. In addition, a January 21, 1987 meeting at 2:30 PM in the Faculty House has been designated for receipt of additional faculty input.

**Professor Coolidge (HIST)** asked if the committee planned to address the question of evaluation being considered by CHE?

**Altekruse** replied that no action on this issue would be taken now as apparently no public documents are available at this time.

**Becker (HIST)** inquired what the reaction of certain accrediting agencies, such as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, would be if CHE implemented their staff's recommendations.
Provost Borkowski felt that such accrediting agencies would not be in opposition to implementation at this time. However, he stated that if such implementation did occur it could seriously erode faculty perogatives.

E. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Howard-Hill, Chairman:

Howard-Hill announced the committee is making some progress on the question of faculty benefits. A tele-conference with the Committee's counterpart at Clemson University has taken place. A questionnaire to faculty will be circulated and it is probable a public meeting will be called to allow faculty to address specific issues that may be raised following a report to Senate on the questionnaire results.

The committee is also investigating the question of faculty salaries. They will accept faculty input on this matter.

IV. Report of Secretary.

Silvernail noted the next Faculty Senate meeting would be in February.

V. Unfinished Business.

None.

VI. New Business.

Herr (BIOL) noted that in the Faculty Manual there is a list of committees whose members are appointed by the president. One of these is the Library Committee. In the past few weeks he has been exposed to newspaper articles and remarks on TV referring to our Library situation. These items did not seem to give a complete story and he felt the faculty should be well informed on the Library, where it stands, the nature of its holdings, annual accessions and expenditures. The Library Committee has a hand on all these statistics as well as where we stand in library resources with our peer institutions.

Herr then moved the Faculty Senate request the Library Committee prepare a library status report for presentation at the February Faculty Senate meeting. (Inherent in the motion is the expectation the report would include Committee recommendations for future development of the Library's resources.)

The motion was seconded.

Professor Tucker (SOCY) asked if the report would include the report made about a year ago by the Graduate Council, sometimes called the Greiner Report?
Herr replied he would prefer not to instruct the Library Committee on what the report should include.

Howard-Hill (ENGL) announced he was speaking in support of the motion and noted the Greiner Report reflected a specialized use of the library. However, he felt the Greiner Report should not be set aside just because it was submitted to Graduate Council and it is possible the Faculty Senate might wish to consult that report. For example, one of the recommendations of the report was to make the Library Committee a Faculty Senate Committee. He did not understand why this recommendation had not come to Faculty Senate.

Rembert pointed out we are asking the University Library Committee, an appointed committee, to report to Senate by the February meeting.

Stephens (JOUR) was unsure what would be reported in February -- their willingness to report or indeed a factual report.

Herr replied that he felt the Library Committee would be able to make a factual report as they would not be starting from ground zero.

There was no further discussion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Rembert announced he would inform the presidentially-appointed Library Committee they have an invitation, not a mandate, to appear at the February meeting.

Rembert issued a call for additional nominations for the vacancy on Student Affairs Committee. There were none and Professor Eddie Gaffney (PRSC) was declared elected.

VII. Good of the Order.

Safko (ASTR) reminded the faculty that a happy hour would be held late afternoon in Faculty House on Reading Day for members.

Pauluzzi (FORL) wanted to know why the minutes of the previous meetings arrive so late and why nominations, as the one above, do not appear in the agenda.

Rembert replied that it has long been the policy of Faculty Steering Committee to attempt to fill committee vacancies as soon as possible when they occur. This way the activities of a committee will not be delayed. However, there is nothing that mandates that this be done and Faculty Steering will take the question under advisement.
He then proceeded to explain why the past minutes arrive so close to the next meeting. Committee reports are published in the agenda and these committees meet at various times during the month. The committee reports are then put in order along with the minutes. Printing must have at least a week, preferably 10 days to produce and mail the document.

VIII. Announcements.

Rembert again reminded the Senate that the next meeting would be February 4, 1987.

There being no further business, the meeting, with a quorum present, was adjourned at 4:44 PM.