MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 5, 1986

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 PM by Chairman David H. Rembert, Jr.

I. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

Professor Herr (BIOL) noted that references to Faculty Steering Committee should read Faculty Senate Steering Committee. The minutes were approved as distributed.

II. Reports of Officers.

President Holderman reported on the status of the current budget situation and noted that the University is taking the lead in attempting to head off a two percent cut. He questioned the perceived "sanctity" of the one hundred million dollar reserve fund and indicated we are strongly recommending that the fund be utilized in the current situation.

President Holderman announced that the Commission on Higher Education will shortly receive an agency-commissioned report from an out-of-state consultant on the status of higher education. At this time we know nothing of the contents or recommendations. He then called for questions.

Professor Sederberg (GINT) stated that several faculty had tickets for Dr. Kissinger's talk, arrived early, and were turned away. He wished to know what type of corrective measures could be taken to prevent this from occurring again.

President Holderman said he did not know that had happened and that he would look into it. He did take the opportunity to stress a larger auditorium, which would be available in the proposed Koger Center, is necessary.

Sederberg stated that the USC Educational Foundation had considered a policy of divestment in firms that were involved in the Union of South Africa. He wished to know if the President thought this was an appropriate policy for the Foundation to consider. He further noted that Leon Sullivan was not satisfied with the results of divestment and the principles underlying divestment should be reexamined within 18 months. He then asked if the University would reconsider on the basis of this knowledge.
President Holderman responded that he thought it was appropriate that the Boards of both the Educational Foundation and the Research and Development Foundation consider the questions of divestment and the Sullivan Principles. He noted the Board of Trustees of the University actually holds no funds. State monies are in the hands of the State Treasurer who has indicated divestiture would take place if state funds are involved. He also predicted that if Sullivan finds the policy is not working after a given time period, the policy may be reconsidered.

Professor Datta (PHYS) inquired into the status of the proposed Graduate Science Center.

President Holderman responded, saying that an arrangement had been worked out with the Commission on Higher Education and the Budget and Control Board which would include planning for both the Graduate Science Center and a music building if the new capital buildings bond issue passes. If the bill passes, planning would start this coming year. He emphasized the importance of constructing the Graduate Science Center, the new music building next to the Koger Center and the Swearingen Engineering Center.

Professor Jay (ENGL) asked how we compared to other state universities in regard to percentage allocations of the budget for such as salaries, support staff and other line items.

President Holderman answered by saying we compare very well with other state universities with about 60 percent of the budget allocated to academic support and instruction and if library is added in, it would be higher. Our administrative costs account for about 11 percent of the budget. He felt that the "facts and figures are pretty demonstrative that our first priority is the academic dimension of the University."

There were no further questions.

Provost Borkowski also responded to Professor Jay's question by adding that cuts during the 1981-83 budget years were taken primarily from the non-academic sectors. He also noted that support areas can be cut only so much before the academic sector is affected. He used the example of building maintenance to prove the point. Some 18-23 years ago a large number of buildings were constructed and as roofs last about 20 years, we are now faced with the problem of trimming back elsewhere or run the risk of losing buildings due to faulty roofs. At this time he recapped his budget statements given at earlier Senate meetings.

The Provost then reported on a meeting held with the deans on the two percent cut in the current budget year and outlined the procedure which will be followed.

1. A numbered budget account will be assigned to each college.
2. The deans will see to it that the amount in the numbered budget account will correspond to the assigned cut in the college budget.

3. The Provost's office will also have a numbered account into which the college accounts will be swept. This will be an escrow account.

4. This money will not go into a central University escrow account nor will it go out of the University.

5. If funds are restored to the University budget, it will be easy to shift them back to the colleges.

6. Basically, it is the dean's decision where the money will come from in each college.

Professor Datta (PHYS) inquired if the budget cut would be reflected in the salary range next year.

Provost Borkowski: "No, there is no relation to the two percent cut and the salary range."

III. Report of Committees.

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

Silvernail noted the misnumbering in the report, page A-2 should be page A-3 and page A-3 should be page A-2. He stated the report, basically the responses of faculty committees to selected recommendations of the Lightsey Commission, was being submitted to the Senate for their information.

Chairman Rembert asked if individual committees might make recommendations of their own based on their review of the Report.

Silvernail answered in the affirmative and said these would be submitted at the time of their regular report to the Senate.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Elfe, Chairman:

Elfe moved the adoption of the committee report found on pages A-6 through A-8. By a voice vote, the report was adopted. Elfe then withdrew from consideration at this time committee motions on page A-5.
C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor Hark, Chairman:

Hark made the following changes in the report:

1. SPAN 350X - Delete from description: May not be repeated for credit.

2. In Section V, Proposal for Core Curriculum, line 1 - replace should with shall.

3. In Section V, part 2 - withdrawn from consideration at this time.

Hark moved approval of Section I, part A.

Professor Goode (CHEM) inquired if the laboratory analysis mentioned in the description of ANTH 322 should require a chemistry prerequisite.

Hark asked if anyone from Anthropology would respond. There was no response from Anthropology and she then removed ANTH 322 from consideration at this time.

The remaining item in Part I.A. was approved by voice vote.

Hark moved in succession the adoption of Section I.B, C., D., and E., and Sections II., and III. By voice vote each section was adopted. Section IV was submitted for the Senate's information.

HARK moved the adoption of Section V, items l.A. thru E. (item V.2. having been withdrawn earlier) dealing with the committee's "Proposal for a Core Curriculum at USC-Columbia Campus." After a lengthy discussion, including several questions from Professor Carlsson (BADM), Professor Costa (PHIL), and Professor West (Sumter), Professor West, a member of Curricula and Courses Committee, moved to recommit Section V to committee. The motion to recommit was seconded and by voice vote the proposal was recommitted.

Professor Pettus (ENGR) noted as a point of information that the College of Engineering requires 24 hours of non-engineering courses in addition to ENGL 101 and 102.

Professor Long (PHIL) suggested that if the proposal were resubmitted to the Senate that some rationale for the recommended areas accompany the submission.
D. Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee, Professor Sear, Chairman:

Sear moved the committee report which would reduce to 60 the number of transfer hours from a junior college or two-year institution.

Provost Borkowski commented on the motion by noting that House Bill 3094, which was defeated, would have provided for accrediting or applying courses taken at one state institution to another state institution and the bill would have defined "state institution." There seems to be a national trend to encroach upon the traditional rights and responsibilities of the faculty in establishing curriculum and to move toward flexibility and openness in transferring credit. This motion could create a problem for students on our two- and four-year campuses. That in turn might lead to the passage of another House Bill 3094.

After extensive discussion, Professor Helterman (ENGL) moved to amend the motion to read . . . 60 semester hours from outside the University System may be transferred . . . .

Following lengthy additional discussion, Professor Sederberg (GINT) moved to recommit the committee recommendation. It was seconded. Motion to recommit takes precedence over a motion to amend. By voice the recommendation was recommitted to committee.

Professor Darran (Sumter) recommended the committee obtain input from the University System Campuses.

IV. Report of Secretary.
None.

V. Unfinished Business.
None.

VI. New Business.
None.

VII. Good of the Order.

Professor Mould (SCCC) requested clarification of the Curricula and Courses Committee report, section III, Part B, Department of Computer Science. He wanted to know if a computer science student
should no longer enroll in MATH 141 but should enroll in MATH 174. He noted in the Bulletin that a grade of C or better is required for MATH 141.

Professor Mercer (College of Science and Mathematics) stated such a student should take MATH 141 at some point and that MATH 174 should be scheduled early if a student plans to take advanced programming courses. MATH 141 and 142 are still required courses.

Professor Pettus (ENGR) felt that more time was needed to reflect and discuss committee recommendations on items such as the Lightsey Commission Report. He did not feel such delay would be detrimental.

Rembert responded by noting the Lightsey Commission recommendations had been released in October and Senate Steering Committee's plan of procedure announced in December. The appropriate committees had been identified and chairmen's names published at that time. In addition, the committee reactions and reports were on the agenda in advance of the required three day minimum before the Senate meeting.

Pettus said that arising discussion was valuable and informative.

Rembert agreed and reminded the Senate that following today's discussion several items were being recommitted to committee.

VIII. Announcements.

Professor Felix (IAWS) informed the Senate the Fulbright Program's 40th Anniversary Conference will be held at Hilton Head, March 21-23. The keynote speaker will be President Holderman. Anyone needing further information should contact Professor Felix.

Professor Tucker (SOCY) reminded the Senate of the St. Valentine's Day dinner-dance on 14 February. There will be a dinner-dance on 18 April and on 6 May there will be the general meeting for the members of Faculty House.

Rembert announced, as information to the Faculty, the existence of the Office of Special Events. This office can be used to help cut down on time conflicts particularly when outside speakers or events are being scheduled.

Rembert reminded the Senate that it was again nominations time. Senate Steering Committee will meet on 12 February to prepare a slate of nominees to replace faculty rotating off elected committees and appointments to non-elected committees. If faculty have any suggestions for colleagues who might be good nominees or appointees please submit their names to the Faculty Senate Office by Wednesday morning.

There was no further business and the meeting was adjourned at 4:12 P.M.