MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF APRIL 4, 1984

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. by Chairman Charles B. Weasmer.

I. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

PROFESSOR WARD BRIGGS, FOREIGN LANGUAGES, stated that he would like to amend his remarks on page M-2, where it says "reduced from 4 to 1". It should now read "reduced from 4 to 3".

SECRETARY HUSBAND also stated that on page M-10 first paragraph, next to the last line, the word "extraordinary" should be inserted between "and/or" and "budgetary". It should read: "The Committee consults with and advises the Administration on annual and/or extraordinary budgetary matters and about the long term fiscal strategy of the University."

II. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT HOLDERMAN reported to the Senate as follows:

First of all, the budget is moving along well in the Legislature. We are very optimistic about full-formula funding and we want you to understand that even with full-formula funding we won't be able to do what everybody wants to do. We are running $80,000,000 behind over the last seven years and we will never catch up on that. We are also encouraged to believe that the Legislature is for the first time in quite a while going to fully fund the salary package. As you know since 1976, the rules were changed that required agencies which could charge fees and tuitions (and obviously this includes the University), to meet their salary increases from their own sources. We have had to absorb 25-35% of our package on salaries. We had breakfast with the Senate Education Committee this morning and we feel considerable optimism that the case for higher education is being heard quite reasonably and effectively.

The Summit Fund is moving along very well. We anticipate over the next few days getting $25,000,000 out of the $35,000,000 that we planned to raise. I think we will exceed our $35,000,000 goal by the end of the calendar year. If all things break the way we hope they will we will have some major gifts announced and several yet to be finalized. What I think this really does to us is that we will probably never stop fund raising in a major way again at the University of South Carolina in order to build the kind of endowment which we need.

The Family Fund exceeded $1,000,000 which is a great tribute to this faculty and the staff of the University. Only one other university in the country has ever gone beyond a million dollars in its own family fund and that was the University of Georgia several years ago. We can take some pride and I think we are going to surpass Georgia.

Construction on the engineering building will begin in mid-summer and hopefully completed by the middle of 1986.

On April 14th, the President of the Dominican Republic, with whom the University now has extensive ties, will be on the campus for a convocation and an honorary degree as the University expands its activities in the Caribbean. There will be a major meeting of Caribbean leadership here later this summer to hopefully establish the Caribbean as a new turf of the University. Again, clearly we are the most active university in that part of the world and it is a good time to be there.
Our commencement speaker will be Carl Sagan and this ought to be an exciting event.

DR. HOLDERMAN then asked if there were any questions from the Senate floor.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, asked the President about his nine day trip to Japan and what was accomplished by this trip.

The PRESIDENT responded as follows:

We have two $1,000,000 commitments from two major Japanese companies for equipment purchases for the new Engineering Center. We have a commitment from the Japanese government to fund the new Japan Center here at Carolina. We have expanded the number of interns that they will take in the Japanese track from the MIBS program by visiting with a number of Japanese corporate leaders. I think that the University will profit substantially in more ways than just materially. It was a productive experience and will add a lot to the dimensions of the University. Particularly, we are very pleased because the Foreign Minister himself (who visited here two years ago as the Minister of Trade and Industry) said he expects to be the new Prime Minister and that he would come back to the University of South Carolina to give his first public lecture in the United States as the Prime Minister of Japan.

PROFESSOR MOORE said he had a few other items to be addressed:

First of all, I would like to ask you or Dr. Borkowski if you have any comments about the Gordon McAndrew episode that was in the newspaper. It is my understanding that there was an explanation for some of the irregularities that appeared in John Norton's article. I think it might be useful to clarify the background. The other thing is that I understand that there was to be a pilot program for senior students in nursing to be inaugurated this semester whereby 10-15 nurses would go to various hospitals for training by the nursing staff and my understanding is that that it has not yet taken place and I would like to ask for a progress report.

PRESIDENT HOLDERMAN requested Dean Mulhern of the College of Education to respond to the question concerning Dr. McAndrew and the Provost to answer the question about the nursing program.

DEAN MULHERN responded as follows:

When Mr. Norton called me I told him there was no foundation to his inquiries that the position had been designed for Gordon McAndrew but he chose to print a front page story as a result of my statement. The position was not designed for a particular person but it was designed for a particular type of person. A person who has credibility with South Carolina school administrators, the State Department of Education, and the Governor's Office. So on the basis of that I made the decision not to advertise it in the Chronicle of Higher Education which had not been productive in terms of finding people who have that kind of knowledge of South Carolina. In terms of further advertising of it, it is probably my error not to run it for two weeks in the Greenville News and the Charleston newspapers. Are there any other questions about this matter?

PROFESSOR MOORE inquired if any attempt had been made to correct Mr. Norton's errors?

DEAN MULHERN stated that he told Mr. Norton that he was incorrect and the other newspaper reporters that called him but that he did not have a great deal of success in correcting Mr. Norton's original impressions.

PROVOST BORKOWSKI responded:

I can add to that just a bit in that the writer also called me about the position, and I did not realize that he also called Jack, although the information that we supplied paralleled each
other. I cautioned him that indeed it was a position designed for a specific individual in the state of South Carolina. Superintendents were all aware of the establishment of the center. It had been discussed with them. His question was "has this been discussed with Gordon McAndrew?" My response was "Yesterday, I stopped into a luncheon that the Dean was hosting in Faculty House with superintendents of Lexington and Richland counties (there were about thirty people present) and one of the subjects for discussion was the center." Gordon McAndrew was one of the participants. I told John Norton that that was the case so I assumed that there was some discussion with Gordon since he was a part of that group.

There are probably six to ten people who would meet the qualifications for the position. It would have been easy to say at that point that Gordon McAndrew's qualifications do not fit the description of the position and indeed they do not. But you know it is tough to say that when Gordon McAndrew may have deemed it appropriate to apply for this position.

In terms of the question raised about the nursing program, Ray, I really don't know the answer to that. I just don't know why senior nursing students are not being placed in residencies in hospitals by staff and supervised by the College of Nursing. If there is anyone here from the College of Nursing who could respond to that I would be delighted.

PROFESSOR LOIS WIDING, COLLEGE OF NURSING, said she would be pleased to speak to question on the activities of the College of Nursing if Professor Moore would elaborate more on his question.

PROFESSOR MOORE said:

I have gotten information that an arrangement was made for a pilot program to be inaugurated this semester for various nurses in the senior class to go out to various hospitals in the community for a kind of internship and I understand that there has been a rather long standing hesitation on the part of the Nursing School to indeed go along with this kind of pilot program. I just wonder how quickly this will take place after presumably an agreement has been made.

PROFESSOR LOIS WIDING, COLLEGE OF NURSING, responded:

About a year ago there was internal discussion in the College of Nursing relating to this pilot program perse which is not terribly different in many respects from our long standing practice of bringing seniors into a variety of clinical agencies for specialized practice in the different clinical areas. I don't have an answer to the disposition of the pilot program except that our normal practices continue to occur in many community agencies under the direction of the faculty. I do know that considerable energy in the College is being used toward the development of preceptorships for graduate students across our clinical areas in the community.

PROFESSOR MOORE requested that Professor Widing inquire as to the nature of the program and also why it had not been implemented and then report back to the Senate in May.

PROFESSOR CAROL WILLIAMS, COLLEGE OF NURSING, added that about three years ago a pilot study involving preceptorship that she could recall had been planned for a group of fifteen students but approximately five students actually participated in it when it was implemented.
III. Reports of Committees.

A. Steering Committee, Secretary David D. Husband:

PROFESSOR HUSBAND reported as follows:

I would like to make the motion that the Senate Steering Committee wishes to place before the Senate on page A-1 of the agenda. This motion was made at our last meeting for the purpose of discussing and voting upon at this meeting. The motion is to change the bylaws of the Faculty Senate, page 98 of the Faculty Manual, to read as follows:

"A majority shall consist of one plus the quotient of the total number of votes cast for all candidates divided by twice the number of vacancies on a given committee."

There being no discussion, the motion was approved.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Carol Collison, Chair:

On behalf of the Grade Change Committee, PROFESSOR COLLISON moved the adoption of the Committee's report. The report was adopted.

C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor Robert B. Pettus, Chair:

PROFESSOR PETTUS moved the adoption of Section I, College of Health, page A-4. PROFESSOR COLIN BENNETT, MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, asked Professor Pettus to explain what was involved in bicycle touring. PROFESSOR PETTUS stated that this issue had been discussed at great length by the Committee but that he would prefer if someone from the Department of Physical Education would address the question. PROFESSOR JOHN SPURGEON, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, answered that he believed that this is a substantial lifetime sports skill having to do with excessive stress and so forth. There being no further discussion, Section I, College of Health was approved.

PROFESSOR PETTUS corrected Section II, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, as follows:

We have several changes which I believe are minor changes to Section II, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, particularly under item 2. Major Requirements, a. General Major, the first word in the third sentence "which" should be replaced by "that", so that it now reads: "history courses that may include the six hours". On page A-5, subsection V, in the first sentence which states "The department will determine into which of the 4" the numeral 4 should be spelled out - "four". The same correction should be made under b. Intensive major, line two, "6" should be spelled out - "six". Under the same area in the Note which states "an intensive major must maintain a B" add the words "at least" so it now reads: "(Note: an intensive major must maintain at least a B average . . . .)." And finally, the third line below that again the word "which" should be replaced by :that" so it would now read: "a foreign language requirement that may be satisfied."

I would like to move the adoption of Section II, College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

PROFESSOR PATRICK SCOTT, ENGLISH, asked Professor Pettus his reason for changing "which" to "that"?
PROFESSOR PETTUS responded:

As you know these documents are distributed to all members of the faculty and we get changes suggested when they come from people who have reason to know what they are doing. We generally don't dispute them. The changes from "which" to "that" seem to be reasonable. The changes of spelling out the digits are consistent with the policy of spelling out single digits and using the numeral for 10 and above.

PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE, JOURNALISM, pointed out a typographical error in the next to the last line of the intensive major, the word "satisfactory", the "t" and "o" were transposed.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER said that change would be made.

PROFESSOR SCOTT moved to amend Professor Pettus' motion so as to insert a comma following the word "courses" and to restore the word "which" in place of the proposed change to "that". The amendment was approved. Section II, College of Humanities and Social Sciences was then passed as amended.

PROFESSOR PETTUS moved for approval Section III, College of Journalism and Section IV, South Carolina College. He also called the Senate's attention to Section V, College of Health, an experimental course. Sections III and IV were approved.

D. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Natalie K. Hevener, Chair:

PROFESSOR HEVENER stated she had two items to present as information for the Senate: (1) report on the VALIC investigation and (2) a bill recently passed by the House which would allow using money from the state employees health insurance reserve fund to cover general spending for 1984-85. She added that she didn't believe that either of these items required any action.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER asked if there were any questions concerning the report.

DEAN JULIAN FINCHER, PHARMACY, said the fact of the matter is that VALIC salesmen sold their plan on the basis that the interest rates could not be changed and it is also a fact that it can be changed by their Board of Directors. He added that the plan was misrepresented by their salesman.

PROFESSOR HEVENER asked Professor Mike Ferri, a member of the subcommittee which investigated this matter, if he would like to comment on this.

PROFESSOR MICHAEL FERRI responded as follows:

We have investigated this issue and we decided that it was impossible for us to reconstruct any conversations that took place in the privacy of individual offices. We do know that many faculty members who should have read the contract carefully did not do so and that they emerged from the conversations feeling that they were guaranteed a specific interest rate when in fact they were not. We found that VALIC's change in the policy was a) consistent with industry practice, b) quite consistent with current capital markets, and c) was permitted by the contract which our faculty members accepted when they entered the program. We felt under those circumstances there was perhaps nothing we could do except to warn all Ph.D.'s on our staff in the future to read the contracts before they enter it.

PROFESSOR ROBERT STEWART, SOCIOLOGY, asked Professor Ferri if he meant to say that the report of individual faculty members about what the salesman said to them was irrelevant to your consideration of this matter and if so why.

PROFESSOR FERRI answered:

It was relevant. It was that set of complaints that led us to investigating the matter, so those complaints stimulated our efforts which could hardly be considered irrelevant. We did feel that there were numerous people who had emerged from those conversations with the belief that they had a guarantee
that the interest rate would never be rescheduled. We feel that this belief was in some sense stimulated by a true rendering of VALIC's history; that it had not in its past ever seen fit to change interest rates on money once they were entered into the coffer. VALIC bragged about that and one of its salesmen in his conversations with me said that perhaps their salesmen may have been too zealous in pointing that out to the consumer. I did not personally leave that conversation with the belief I could be guaranteed interest rates. I read the contract and it states a minimum guarantee far below the 13-14% prevalent in the national market at that time. The Committee discussed this matter with very talented legal people who felt that there was nothing that could be done regarding those conversations, that legal action was not likely to be fruitful. Also, individuals could draw their contracts away from VALIC into some other program, get all credited interest, all the money put into it, and they could do so without any tax consequence. There are numerous other programs available. I do not know under the circumstance what else you can do. We cannot go back and reconstruct those conversations and we cannot go back and recapture the enthusiasm with which professors who did not read their contracts received the words from the salesmen. We can't do that. I personally would not make any charge in public against any individual about misrepresentation. VALIC is acting within the scope of its contract, the scope of the law, and the scope of current practice in the industry. I do not know what else we can say.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, said he would like to suggest that Professor Hevener send a copy of the inquiry of the complaint and the investigation to VALIC with perhaps the suggestion that they encourage their salesmen to be a little more accurate in their representation or to guard their language rather carefully in the presentations that they make.

PROFESSOR FERRI pointed out that in the subcommittee's report they stated that the senior officers of VALIC were contacted and that the complaints that the subcommittee had received were made known to them. He added that he also told them that they did harm themselves considerably by this situation but they did not believe that was the case as they have had very few complaints from South Carolina. He added that they had certainly made that point to them because we do know that there are people that are quite upset about it.

PROFESSOR ROBERT ROOD, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, said:

I have no vested interest here. If anybody is in TIAA they will notice that the projected earnings of TIAA have declined last year in terms of their expected payoff which is not inconsistent with industry practice. Also, two years ago the Welfare Committee did conduct an investigation about misrepresentation in which complaints were filed. If any one feels previously harmed they do have the opportunity to file a written complaint to the State Insurance Department - Consumer Affairs Division. Generally, what happens is you get your money back if the complaint is found valid and in fact you are already guaranteed that if you wish to withdraw and enroll in another tax sheltered annuity you can.

PROFESSOR JOHN PEARCE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, spoke:

I am one of Mike's colleagues and I read the report and I understood it and I chose to ignore it in favor of what I thought was professional counsel from someone who had my best interests at heart. My concern is not for me or for those of us who made a mistake, but for the welfare of the University faculty. If in fact we believe that the University faculty should be warned about possible misrepresentation from an agent that doesn't have our personal best interests at heart I think that is an appropriate action for this body to take.
PROFESSOR HEVENER replied as follows:

As faculty members we must be aware that the only guarantee that we can rely on is the written contract that we receive and we must be sure that we pay closer attention to that. My main concern as a non-expert on the committee is that we recognize our responsibilities for looking at this material and realize that when we have salesmen in our office that they are there to sell a product and they are going to sell it with whatever enthusiasm that they feel is desirable and yet not to go beyond the limits of what they can say.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER said it was his understanding that the committee was going to formulate some guidelines along the lines that you indicated so as to give faculty members some professional advice as to what to look for and what questions to ask.

PROFESSOR HEVENER stated that they had rejected that course of action because formulating guidelines is a very complex matter partly due to the fact there are so many different tax sheltered annuities available with different kinds of legal specifications. She added that the kinds of questions and guidelines you would want would vary greatly from plan to plan.

There was no further discussion or comments on this issue.

PROFESSOR HEVENER reported on the committee's second item of business as follows:

Again for information, I would like to let you know what is going on in the Legislature. The House recently sent to the Senate a bill which would allow them to take over $20,000,000 from the State Employees Health Insurance Reserve Fund. This fund is made up from a variety of sources but approximately one-third of it comes from the money that state employees pay for dependent benefits and for extended health coverage. This fund has been growing at the rate of $1,000,000 a month. As you may have noticed, our premiums have gone up but our coverage has decreased. The House bill will take this money to cover general spending for 1984-85. We received a request from Clemson University Faculty Senate to consider a resolution which they passed which objected to the fact but which included a provision that this action might be justified if some sort of restoration of benefits was included in it. My conversations with the President of the State Employees Association has told me that part of the legislation does include this action. That is, the legislation on the one hand is taking the $20,000,000, but more than $20,000,000 will be restored in benefits including the following things: a return to the $100 deductible in our medical care and improved hospital coverage and also a dental care program. It is the opinion of the President of the State Employees Association that the overall effect of this will be an improvement in coverage beyond the cost of the $20,000,000. It still has to go to the Senate Finance Committee and to the Senate floor for a vote. There are some members of the faculty who are concerned about this precedent. We don't have any recommendation on this but I wanted to make you aware of it and to let you know that this was happening. I would be happy to answer questions.

PROFESSOR MICHAEL FERRI stated:

I would like to point out that there is some possible tax problem connected with the General Assembly using money that we put into insurance accounts for general revenue spending. It sounds like taxes that we are being assessed and yet we were not getting credit as a tax payment. I would suggest more strongly that the Faculty Senate find an appropriate body to protect us from this action. I would suggest in particular that we lodge a letter of protest against the action with the appropriate signatures with the General Assembly and I make that as a motion.
CHAIRMAN WEASMER asked Professor Ferri whom should this protest be lodged with. PROFESSOR FERRI suggested that we ask one of our legal members for the appropriate body to lodge the protest with.

PROFESSOR HEVENER pointed out that it still had to go to the Senate Finance Committee and then to the Senate for approval but that we could still send it to the House although they have already passed it.

PROFESSOR BARBARA TENENBAUM, HISTORY, seconded the motion.

The CHAIR asked if there was any discussion on this motion.

PROFESSOR ROBERT FELIX, LAW SCHOOL, asked:

I would like to ask a representative of the University Administration whether in the course of whatever monitoring is done on legislation that may affect the University if any attention has been given to this matter.

PROVOST BORKOWSKI responded:

Not to my knowledge. In our monitoring of legislation our attention has been principally on specific issues that deal with full-formula funding, salary packages, and so forth but there has been nothing on this matter precisely.

PROFESSOR HEVENER stated that for a point of consistency she would read the Clemson Faculty Senate resolution:

"Whereas the House Ways and Means Committee has proposed taking $26.7 million from the State Employees Health Insurance Reserve Fund to be used for general-fund state spending in the 1984-85 fiscal year, and

Whereas, the Insurance Reserve Fund is intended to keep the state employees health insurance plan actuarially sound, and much of the money in the reserve originated from premiums paid by state employees.

Be it therefore resolved that the legislature be urged not to use the insurance reserve for general-fund spending, but that any portion of the reserve which originated from state employees' premium payments be used for an immediate reduction in premiums and/or restoration of benefits.

Be it further resolved that the remainder of the Employees Health Insurance Reserve Fund be maintained as a cushion against rising costs, postponing the need for another premium increase."

PROFESSOR PORTER McLAURIN, APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES, said that he would suggest that the point he heard was something about taxation so that some statement should be added to the protest which would point out that if there is going to be a taking of money from this fund, the state employees should be notified so that they can receive a tax credit on their federal taxes.

The CHAIR said that we will then understand that the tax aspect is a part of the motion before us then.

PROFESSOR McLAURIN agreed that it should be considered part of the motion.

PROFESSOR BRIAN FRY, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, asked, "On the Clemson resolution, are you saying that they will allow this action if we get some restoration of benefits or are they saying that funds within the current reserve would make the restoration of benefits?"
PROFESSOR HEVENER said her understanding of the present legislation is that the money would be taken for general spending and that they would then agree to legislation to make these other alterations.

PROFESSOR FRY responded that it sounded like a bribe to him and that it was a very dangerous precedent.

PROFESSOR DAVID HILL, FOREIGN LANGUAGES, suggested that we support the Clemson motion as stated. He added that it seems quite clear and he thought that would add to the force of the motion if the objection to this action would be supported by two sister institutions.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER said the problem is that the situation has changed since they enacted the resolution which is why Professor Hevener has presented this as a matter of information rather than asking for an endorsement of their resolution. He explained that what you have is a motion that we lodge a protest in the name of the Faculty Senate about the use of employees insurance money for general fund expenses.

PROFESSOR FERRI said that in the interest of time he would like to support the simplified version and just present it and ask the Faculty Welfare Committee to draft a letter along those lines and make it as similar as possible to the Clemson resolution. He added that he believed if we acted in concert with our sister University it may be valuable politically.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER said that in the interest of time can we agree that since I am Chairman of the Senate and I will have to sign and send this I do this in consultation with the Chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee.

PROFESSOR FERRI replied that he had complete trust in him.

PROFESSOR GLENN ABERNATHY, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, said in the further interest of clarity he would like to see that this resolution was not muddied by reference to the tax deduction process.

PROFESSOR CAROL FLAKE-HOBSON, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, said that she would like to make a motion to remove that tax statement from the motion. She added that she believed if we acted in concert with our sister University it may be valuable politically.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER stated that the motion was to amend the previous motion so as to delete from our letter of protest any reference to the tax consequences of this use of state employees insurance funds.

PROFESSOR DAVID HILL, FOREIGN LANGUAGES, said the best point is simply to direct the Clemson motion to the proper Senate committee now that it is out of the House and let it go at that. He added that Clemson's statement was absolutely clear.

PROFESSOR HEVENER said she would be glad to promise that if unfortunately it does go through she would come back and ask if the Senate would like to have a motion on the package.

The CHAIR asked for approval of the motion to amend. The motion to amend passed. He then stated that the Senate was back to the original motion which is to lodge a letter of protest in the name of the Faculty Senate about the use of employees insurance money for general fund expenses. He added that this would be done and as promptly as possible so as not to make the whole matter moot.

The motion passed as amended.

E. Admissions Committee, Professor Q. Whitfield Ayres, Chairman:

PROFESSOR AYRES addressed the Senate as follows:

I have two announcements for information. I would like to call the Senate's attention to the catalog statement for admission requirements on page M-28 of the handout which is altered to reflect the decision of the Faculty Senate last month to include two years of foreign language as a requirement for admission by 1988. The Commission on Higher Education some months ago printed a brochure listing the specific high school courses that they say are required for admission to any public college or university in South Carolina in the
fall of 1988. The Admissions Committee has indicated to the Provost that we have no objection to the Commission mailing that brochure to South Carolinians. Since all South Carolina high school students should have an opportunity to complete those courses by 1988 and since any student meeting the requirements as stated in the CHE brochure will also meet USC's requirements as adopted by the Faculty Senate. To make it clear that our English requirement would not include a course such as Business English, the Admissions Committee has agreed to insert the word "college preparatory" for the English units in the catalog statement. We believe this is only an editorial change, as it was quite clearly the intent of the Admissions Committee and the Senate for those four English units to be college preparatory. We certainly hope that this will resolve any impass with the Commission. We think if we are going to fight the Commission on something then we ought to do so on an issue about which we disagree rather than on one about which I think we basically agree. Second, we have received well over 300 applications for the Provisional Year - 250 positions open for the fall. Quite clearly that indicates substantial interest on the part of students and parents in the state in that Provisional Year Program.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PROFESSOR SCOTT GOODE, CHEMISTRY, stated:

In terms of an editorial change, may I ask if it would be possible to eliminate the words "at least". It has been used here three times in describing the English requirements. "Prospective students are encouraged to include among the four English units at least two having strong grammar and composition components, at least one in English literature, and at least one in American literature." I think that totals all four and we can just state that.

PROFESSOR AYRES responded:

At first blush, I have no objection to doing that. I have some apprehension about opening up debate on the wording of this again. But I have no objection to that if it is the will of the Senate.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER asked if this appeared to the members of this body that this was a change which did not alter the substance of what had been adopted? He added if there was no objection, this change would be made.

IV. Report of Secretary.

SECRETARY DAVID D. HUSBAND reported as follows:

I have two announcements. The first is to announce that the General Faculty meeting for the spring has been scheduled for May 1, 1984 at 3:00 p.m. in the Law School Auditorium. Immediately following the General Faculty meeting the May meeting of the Faculty Senate will convene. Likewise the summer meeting of the Faculty Senate is scheduled for July 5th which is the first day of the final exam period of the first summer session. It will be in Gambrell Hall Auditorium at 3:00 p.m.

Now I would like to report to the Senate the results of the balloting for the contested committee positions. The total number of ballots was 1,096 and 585 ballots were returned.

Admissions Committee
Professor Paula Feldman, Department of English
Professor Gary Griepentrog, College of Business Administration
Athletic Advisory Committee
Professor J. H. Bradburn, College of Engineering
Professor Robert Porter, College of Business Administration

Curriculum and Courses Committee
Professor Jennie Kronenfeld, School of Public Health
Professor Michael Magglio, Government and International Studies

Faculty Advisory Committee
Professor Joan Altekruse, School of Medicine
Professor Roger Sullivan, Department of Philosophy

Faculty Welfare Committee
Professor Dennis Nolan, Law School
Professor Hoyt Wheeler, College of Business Administration

Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee
Professor Steven Hayes, Government and International Studies
Professor Terence Shimp, College of Business Administration

V. Unfinished Business.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER said the unfinished business was the motion of Professor Porter McLaurin requesting that there should be a separate faculty nominating committee.

PROFESSOR PORTER McLaurin, APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES, spoke as follows:

The intent of this particular motion is that in the cycle of committees we may again run into a year in which the Faculty Steering Committee is made up of a large number of people from one college to the exclusion of other colleges on campus. Next year maybe the College of Business, the year after the College of Science and Math, the year after that the College of Education - it could be any college or group of faculty from one small area. This year we have the unusual circumstance in which 50% of the committee is from three departments on the campus and eight of the faculty out of twelve on that particular committee came from one college. The point I made was that if we are going to seek out the very finest leadership available and representation of the broadest possible area of the faculty, it is important if not imperative that representation on a committee for nominations be as broadly based as possible. I concur with the viewpoint that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee is perhaps one of the more representative committees on the entire campus, it does not always have that immensely broad base which provides protection for all of us who may have an interest in serving on a committee and who may not be known by those members on that committee at a particular time. And so I think that in the interest of fair play and in the interest of the broadest possible representation on faculty committees for all colleges involved, that this is a worthwhile move.

PROFESSOR ROGER SULLIVAN, PHILOSOPHY, responded as follows:

It seemed to me that a large number of us walked out of last month's Faculty Senate meeting feeling the same sort of guilt that our mothers inflicted on us when we had been particularly bad children.

During the past weeks I found myself wondering whether anyone in fact deserves the chastening given us at the last Senate meeting. Is the motion made by the Senator from the College of Applied Professional Sciences a just remedy for past unfairnesses?

I've always thought of the Faculty Senate itself as being fairly representative of the faculty in terms of distribution of seats, so I decided to count noses to see just how faculty members in fact are distributed through the University. For the sake of simplification, I simply counted the number of senators allotted each school. That
distribution only approximates one seat for every ten faculty members, but I think the figures I used are close enough to the actual numbers to make my point. If the Senate will bear with me, this is what I found: three schools represent less than 1% each of the total faculty; seven others each have between 1.5% and 5% of the total faculty; four units each have between 5% and 7.5% of the total faculty; and the three largest schools have 8.3%, 10.6%, and 28.8%. With these figures in mind, it seems to me to be bizarre to think that a committee will be more just in the sense of more representative if it is designed so that each vote carries equal weight even though some members represent less than 1% and others from 7% to 29% of the faculty.

Moreover just a little thought shows that a new membership committee, however constituted, cannot solve any discontents about the actual memberships of committees.

As the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (Faculty Manual, Appendix I, Articles V and VI, pp. 97-98) state, nominations from the floor for practically all faculty committees may be made by "any member of the University Faculty" so that it simply is not possible for any one group to control the nomination process.

The actual election of members depends on the way in which the faculty votes - not on the membership of the nominating committee. If some faculty members wish that elections would come out differently than they have in the past, they should put that responsibility where it actually lies - not with the nominating committee but with the manner in which individual faculty members have exercised their franchise.

After examining the matters I have discussed, I myself am not inclined to see that any grave injustices have been perpetrated by the present way in which nominations are made. But perhaps I have missed something important.

PROFESSOR ROOD spoke as follows:

I would oppose the motion. I participated in the nominating process two years ago. Very few nominations were ever suggested by the faculty despite the requests to do that by then Chairman Patterson. In effect, it was left up to the committee to come up with names. For two positions, we would have maybe six names, rank ordered from one to six. We would call those people from one to six and ask them if they would be willing to serve. Very often we got down to our fifth and sixth choices because the first four had declined, and in that case upset our initial distribution across the campus. Sometimes on our list of six, everybody would decline so we were back to the drawing board at the next meeting. Other times people who were asked to serve on committees would decline and then they would get nominated on the floor of the Senate and be elected. By the end of the month - we were going through the University phone book trying to identify faculty members that would make good nominees. Quite frankly I don't think this change is necessary. At least the year I was involved with it we tried to make a good faith effort to ensure distribution. I am sure the committee this year made a good faith effort to ensure broad faculty distribution. I would like to commend the Steering Committee because a number of the nominations were of people who will be involved in faculty governance at the University committee level for the first time.
PROFESSOR PERRY ASHLEY, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM, spoke:

I think Professor Rood's point sort of underlines what I was proposing at the last meeting. Why should you have to look in the telephone directory to seek out someone from another discipline who is willing to serve? Several years ago, we conducted the business of the University as a faculty of the whole and when the faculty got too large to be manageable we decided to go to the present structure and also to depend on faculty committees to do our work. At the March meeting, five pages of courses offered by the English Department were presented to us and as I remember they were passed by this Senate without any discussion, and without a single dissenting vote. At the same time we made what may be a substantial change in the University grievance procedure and if I remember that there was little or no discussion and probably no dissenting votes. Now my point is that we depend on our committees to do our work for us. The best way for us to get representation on any committee including the Steering Committee is in the nominating process.

PROFESSOR BRIAN FRY, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, spoke:

I would like to clarify the objective of the motion. It seems to me that there is in the motion itself the objective of getting broad representation of colleges on the nominating committee. There is a second and different objective of getting equal representation on the faculty committees themselves. I would suggest to you that the first objective does not accomplish the second.

PROFESSOR PORTER MCLAURIN, APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES:

A committee broadly structured would at least have the opportunity of having persons in every college on it. Otherwise there can be a level of ignorance about who might be willing and capable of service. In order to provide the best possible information upon which one can make nominations a broad based committee such as this is terribly important.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, spoke:

I have read and reread the remarks of Professors Ashley, Price and Joyner in last month's minutes and would like to make a few observations regarding them, especially their references to the representative nature of the nominations coming from the Steering Committee.

While I suspect that most of us would agree that wide and fair representation on faculty, and indeed university, committees is desirable, I believe that Professors Ashley, Price and Joyner begin their observations with faulty premises - the same faculty premises that some women operated from a few years back when they brought similar complaints to the Senate. That is, they assume that committees in this University are centers of power, that membership on a committee equals power and influence, and that faculty members by and large really want to serve on committees and exercise responsibility and leadership.

It is my very strong impression that most of our committees have very little power at all - and even those that get engaged in significant policy have only the power to recommend, moreover, most faculty members know this and therefore do not want to serve on them. Committees are time consuming, a necessary evil to be avoided and usually a bloody nuisance. In fact, an "anti-power" struggle usually ensures when nominations are in order. Most faculty members are happy to be ignored and many flatly refuse to stand for nomination and election.
The problem that the Steering Committee usually has is to find people willing to serve, let alone finding those that might be interested in the assignment are qualified to fulfill it.

Granted that a certain amount of ticket-punching goes on for purposes of promotion and tenure, but once that is accomplished, willing workers are hard to find since most know that research and publication pays off around here a lot more than service and teaching, in spite of the trinitarian values espoused in the Faculty Manual. Some deans are even rumored to disencourage their faculty from accepting committee assignments since these are onerous and take time away from research, publication and writing contract proposals.

It is my strong suspicion that any faculty member who feels deprived of the opportunity to serve on a committee need only to volunteer to his/her departmental senators, the Steering Committee or the Chairman of the Faculty Senate and his/her wishes will be granted in some form or another next year or the year after. One of the reasons, I suspect, that Professors Ashley, Price and Joyner have served on so many committees themselves is that they are willing to serve and do a good job as committee members. They should encourage more of their friends to do likewise.

Good faculty citizens are hard to find. They are in relatively short supply. That's one reason why the principle of equal representation is not applicable here. Quota systems and a return to a separate Nominations Committee won't solve the problem they allude to. If there are problems with less than equal representation, then the causes lie with our reward system, the diversity of our interests and talents, a voluntary division of labor and lastly, a lack of interest in academic self-governance by a significant number of our colleagues.

PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE, JOURNALISM, spoke:

Professor Moore made an excellent statement about the power of committees but I would point out to you that the asterisk apparently has a great deal of power because if you follow the results of the election to various faculty committees in each case the one with asterisks by their names indicating they were selected by the Steering Committee were elected in each case. We have bent forward from the College of Journalism the past few years a number of faculty names for committee work and in the past two years if I remember correctly, and I believe I do, none of them have been picked up. They were not selected. I think the point here for Professor Rood is that we have been passing a number of additional duties over to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. It would seem to me that it might be of great benefit to them if we were to create a nominating committee and at least remove that burden from their shoulders.

PROFESSOR WARD BRIGGS, FOREIGN LANGUAGES:

It seems to me that the election of so many of these people with asterisks next to their name is not to show the power of the committee but the trust that the Senate and faculty put in the nominees of that committee. It seems to me that the worst case proposal that Professor McLaurin has made is if possible under the current rule, prohibited by his motion. I think the motion is superfluous for this reason.
PROFESSOR ASHLEY added:

One last parting shot, Mr. Chairman, I think the point has just been made that we do have great trust in our committees which is why these committees should be broadly representative.

PROFESSOR ROBERT FELIX, LAW SCHOOL, spoke:

I would like to speak against the motion. It seems to me that the most effective expression of the position taken by Professor Ashley and those in favor of the motion is to encourage the Steering Committee to try to be broadly representative in its nominations. Whether or not it has been raises an occasional problem and it is not a problem to be confused with the structural issue before us now. Professor Ashley and others have had a chance to propose nominations from the floor. It seems to me that what is proposed is not a committee but a council of college representatives which has to be in its own way disproportionate and unrepresentative. The primary organizing principle as espoused this afternoon is to be representative of the colleges. However representative from the collegial viewpoint this proposed committee will be, it is impoverished by a lack of the experience that the Steering Committee has in seeing how committees operate individually and collectively. I think those who are disatisfied with the behavior of the Steering Committee may have had a point. I don't see the issue as one of fundamental constitutional importance. I think the message for the Steering Committee is plain- try to be more representative.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER spoke:

All in favor of the motion as presented by Professor McLaurin and this will include not just the description of the committee but also the references in the Faculty Manual as described in the second paragraph in attachment 4. The vote is 24 - in favor and 34 - opposed.

Since we have all the new committee members in place, if the chairmen of the committees would convene their committees to elect a chairman for the 1984-85 term. The new chairmen will not take over until the fall.

VI. New Business.

PROFESSOR JOHN F. NOLAN, ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, read the following memorial in honor of Claude Henry Neuffer:

Claude Henry Neuffer was born on November 2, 1911, in Abbeville, South Carolina, the son of Dr. G. A. Neuffer and Florence Henry Neuffer. He is survived by his wife, Irene LaBorde Neuffer; a daughter, Miss Rene LaBorde Neuffer of Columbia; a son, Dr. Francis Henry Neuffer of Mobile; and sisters, Mrs. LeRoy (Florence) Livingston of Bamberg and Miss Maria L. Neuffer of Washington, D.C.

Professor Neuffer received his B. A. degree from Clemson College in 1933 and his M. A. from the University of South Carolina in 1938.

After serving with the Army Air Corps in the China-Burma-India theater during World War II, Claude accepted a teaching position at Presbyterian Junior College in Maxton, North Carolina. From there he came to the University in 1947.
Born and reared in Up-Country South Carolina, he developed a deep love for his native state, its history and traditions. His career at the University reflected this love. He taught a course in South Carolina writers which became famous throughout the state, so well-known, in fact, that on one occasion students from another college, as part of their classwork, came to Columbia to hear him lecture. And, some years later, Claude was recalled from retirement to offer the course in the Southern Studies program at our University.

Equally well-known were his classes in Vocabulary and Semantics, a course established by Professor Havilah Babcock. Claude was a master of word nuances and, in addition, had a thorough knowledge of the Greek and Latin backgrounds of the English language. In the days before computer registration, students informally pre-registered for his vocabulary classes far in advance of regular registration, and those not lucky enough to get places in them would often ask to be put on a waiting list for another semester. Equally well-known was another course which Claude taught, Introduction to Writing. Many a former student of his is a better writer because of having taken it. Because of his sound scholarship, his ability to present ideas clearly, his whimsical humor, and, above all, his concern for his students, Professor Neuffer was one of the most respected and popular teachers at the University. What he said of his colleague Havilah Babcock was also true of Claude himself: "His classes resembled Robert Frost's poems: they began in delight and ended in wisdom."

Professor Neuffer was nationally and internationally known as an onomatologist. In 1954 with Havilah Babcock he co-founded Names in South Carolina, the first state place-name journal in the United States, and continued as its editor until his death. Under his guidance the journal developed from a four-page mimeographed volume into an annual printed volume of fifty pages or more with subscribers in nearly every state and in several foreign countries. During his thirty years as editor, the journal presented studies of over 25,000 South Carolina place names. In recognition of his work the American Name Society in 1978 published a festschrift in his honor.

Besides editing the name journal and writing articles for such publications as American Speech and The Georgia Review, Professor Neuffer co-authored with his wife two books, The Name Game and Correct Mispronunciations of Some South Carolina Names. He also edited The Christopher Hapoldt Journal, an account of young Hapoldt's European tour with the Rev. John Bachman (June-December, 1838).

In addition to his teaching and his scholarly work as editor and author, Claude rendered service to the English Department and the University in various ways. At different times during his career he served as chairman of freshman English, acted as adviser to the student publication The Crucible, chaired the English Department's Information Committee, fostered the establishment of the Havilah Babcock Award in Creative Writing, and acted as chairman of the Maximilian LaBorde Scholarship Committee.

Upon his retirement in 1977 he was awarded the title Distinguished Professor Emeritus.

Mr. Chairman, I think it fitting that we, his colleagues, should recognize the long and dedicated service of Professor Claude Neuffer and honor his memory. I therefore request that these remarks be included in the Senate minutes and that a copy of them be sent to his family.
The CHAIRMAN seeing no objection to this said it would be done.

PROFESSOR BARBARA TENENBAUM, HISTORY, made a motion that prior to the meeting of the Faculty Senate the room intended for use be properly adjusted for maximum effective use and the comfort of the membership of the Senate. The motion was seconded and approved.

VII. Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR ROBERT FELIX, LAW SCHOOL, reported:

I was interested to come here this afternoon lured by the constitutional issue raised by Professor McLaurin's recent motion and I would like to remind the Senate Steering Committee that they need to be representative in nominations.

What interests me more however is the report of the Faculty Welfare Committee this afternoon. I recommend to the Provost and other administrative officers that there be a more comprehensive monitoring of legislation affecting the interests of the University. I know presently of no faculty mechanism for monitoring legislation which may affect faculty and more general interests within the University. What I have particularly in mind is to suggest that the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Steering Committee might be apprised of what the University lobbyist does. I don't think it is yet time to suggest that the faculty need a lawyer but I do think there appears to be a gap.

VIII.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.