MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 1, 1984

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Chairman Charles B. Weasmer.

I. Approval of Minutes.

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of December 7, 1983 were approved as distributed.

II. Reports of Officers.

A. President James B. Holderman:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me report on several items. The budget continues to move forward in the House. It's our anticipation that with new revenue forecasting and as the budget moves to the Senate that we will be in a better position to receive full-formula funding and we are optimistic about that. We wish we could say that even with full-formula funding we would be catching up on those years that we lost. That's not going to happen and we are going to turn to private sources to go beyond full-formula funding in order for us to have that margin for excellence to which we are all committed. But we continue to be very optimistic about seeing the budget fully-funded.

You may have been reading in the papers that the University expressed its official concern that the Commission on Higher Education would involve itself in the setting of all fees and tuition. We have taken a strong position against that intervention. I am told by the Chairman of the Commission on Higher Education that I misunderstood him - I don't think so. It will be brought up tomorrow at the Commission meeting but I think that all the universities and colleges are now on record opposing the Commission involving itself in the setting of all fees and tuition which would really turn them into more of a governing board than a coordinating board.

I can report that the fund drive is continuing to go very well. We are now in excess of $20 million toward our $35 million dollar goal. We have no doubt that we will make that $35 million goal by the end of this calendar year. Yesterday it was announced by the Springs Industries' people that two graduate fellowships per year in the amount of $12,000 each would be given to the University - one in Business and one in an area yet to be chosen. Over a twelve year period, this will amount to something in excess of $500,000 for the University and they are committed to doing it possibly on an expanded basis by starting out with two per year and adding to it in succeeding years thus we will always have (after the second year begins) four scholarship recipients on the campus.

The Family Fund to which the faculty has contributed set a target for $1 million dollars. We have now achieved $966,599.35 I am told. We are well within our million dollar target and I think that in the next few months we will have surpassed the Family Fund goal. I thank each of you who have contributed and tell you that it is much easier to sell the University to an outside prospect when I am able to tell them of the inside interest and specific contribution made by the support and success of the Family Fund.
We are very pleased at the response that we have received on the receipt of the island about ten days ago. Several of you have asked for the fishing and hunting rights on the island and even Ray Moore wants to see about a golf course on the island. It is going to be preserved and protected. Mr. Rhodes also gave us sufficient dollars to cover the cost of the operation of the island which makes the gift (valued at $2.2 million undeveloped) even more valuable to the University and adds substantially to our Marine Science Program.

We expect to break ground in June for the new Swearingen Center. If you happened to see Sunday's Columbia State (January 29, 1984) and saw that insert section on business, education and industry, you saw that virtually every page referred to some activity at the University. The Swearingen Center is moving along very, very well and there is no doubt in our mind that we are going to surpass our $15 million goal in the fund raising activity. Coupled with the acquisition of the South Carolina Electric and Gas facility, we will have a project that is worth in excess of $24 million and net assignable square feet of approximately 300,000. We will have an extraordinarily well equipped and adequately facilitated engineering center.

B. Provost Francis T. Borkowski:

You will all be pleased to see that the new Faculty Manual is now in print and you will be receiving copies of it. The Faculty Manual is not an easy task to put together. The main stay of putting this Manual together has been my good colleague, Steve Ackerman. I would appreciate all of you joining me in giving Steve a round of applause because this is a tough task.

III. Reports of Committees.

A. Steering Committee, David D. Husband, Secretary:

The Steering Committee placed in nomination the name of Professor Shirley Kuiper, College of Business Administration, to serve as a replacement for Professor Susie Van Huss of the College of Business Administration, on the Curricula and Courses Committee for the spring semester, 1984.

The CHAIR asked if there were any further nominations. There being no further nominations at this time, the Chair stated the nominations would remain open until the end of the meeting.

SECRETARY HUSBAND also reported that nominations from the floor of the Senate for all University committees would be entertained at the March 7th Senate meeting. The Steering Committee will also present a list of nominations at that meeting. Suggestions for this list should be sent to the Faculty Senate Office by February 8th.

The SECRETARY also reported on the Steering Committee's ad hoc committee which studied the summer school situation. The Committee consisted of Professors Jessica Kross, Department of History; Colin Bennett, Department of Mathematics and Statistics; and Jerome Jewler, College of Journalism. He added that this ad hoc committee reported to the Steering Committee and that that report was forwarded to the Provost's Office. The Steering Committee wishes to recognize the work that the committee has done.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, PROFESSOR WHITFIELD AYRES presented the recommendation of the Steering Committee on the Provisional Year Program as submitted on pages A-1 - A-5 of the agenda.

PROFESSOR AYRES reported as follows:

We have before us today a very delicate and controversial issue that raises important questions for Carolina. The Provisional Year proposal was originally developed by the College of Applied Professional Sciences and the Administration to address three problems: the first is the future of tenured
faculty members who taught core courses in Applied Professional Sciences. The elimination of the Two-Year Applied Professional Sciences Program left the faculty members without a home. Some of them have had as much as fifteen years or more service at Carolina. A second problem is to maintain or perhaps increase enrollment of minority students. Carolina has developed an outstanding record in that area. Blacks constituted 14 1/2% of our undergraduate enrollment in the fall 1983 semester, and this is one of the highest percentages of any traditional white institution in the country. The black percentages go across the board. For example, in the fall of 1983, the black percentage among new freshmen enrollments - 28% in nursing, 19% in pharmacy, 20% in science and math, 17% in humanities and social sciences, and 19% in criminal justice. Applied Professional Sciences make a substantial contribution in minority enrollment as well. In the fall of 1983, 24% of the new freshmen who enrolled in the two-year Applied Professional Science courses were black. Those 110 new black freshmen constitute 26% of all the new black freshmen enrolled at Carolina. So if we lost the enrollment in those two-year programs we would have only about three-quarters of the number of black freshman enrolled last fall.

The third problem is the overall enrollment - the demographic trends coupled with tightened progression standards have faced us with the prospect of some declining enrollments. Indeed we are already seeing some evidence of that. It is unfortunately true that declining enrollments translate directly to dollars. So last fall, numerous administrators and faculty members spent countless hours in untold numbers of meetings, discussing this Provisional Year proposal that you have before you today.

The Admissions Committee approved the admissions and retention section of the proposal on a 7 to 2 vote and endorsed the principle of the Provisional Year by a 6 to 2 vote with one abstention. The admission requirement of the Provisional Year is 1.75 to 2.0 on a predicted grade point average. Last year the minimum predicted grade point average for the two year programs was 1.5 and for our four-year programs it was 1.9. The Curriculum and Courses Committee approved the curriculum portion of the proposal by a majority vote in November. The Standards and Petitions Committee approved the proposal with a 7-0 vote and the Academic Forward Planning Committee disapproved the proposal with a 0-7 vote.

At that point the proposal went to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. We were faced with conflicting reports of other faculty committees and with the realization that not one of those committees had jurisdiction over the entire proposal. Thus the Faculty Steering Committee assumed jurisdiction over the entire proposal and began discussing it. It soon became clear that the proposal, as it was presented to the Faculty Steering Committee initially, enjoyed only lukewarm support and we began consideration of several alternatives.

I would like to touch briefly on three of the alternatives that were considered. The first was to move the affected Applied Professional Sciences faculty to regular academic departments and this would be predominantly English and History. But that proposal generated some resistance both in the academic departments and among the affected Applied Professional Sciences faculty. We also discussed the possibility of creating a new unit in Humanities and Social Sciences for the Applied Professional Sciences core faculty but likewise that was rejected. We also considered a third proposal to create some new Applied Professional Science courses that would be supplementary to the regular departmental courses. A student enrolling in this program would then be required to take an additional number of hours in order to graduate so that if he took 15 hours in this Applied Professional Sciences Program they would require 15 additional hours in order to graduate. That proposal was openly rejected marginly because
we were uncertain that we could attract the kinds of students we want into the program. While students that predict between 1.75 and 2.0 might not be academic stars they are the bread and butter students of a number of campuses in South Carolina. For a student who predicts right about 2.0, we are talking about someone who graduated possibly halfway down in their high school class and achieved a combined score of 800 on the verbal and mathematics portions of the Scholastic Aptitude Test. So we do not feel that we could get 250 students who were willing to go the extra semester or year and whose parents were willing to provide financial support for a semester or an extra year given the alternative of going to another college for a year and transferring back to Carolina.

The Steering Committee then turned its attention back to the original proposal and made several changes. The first is to require the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to review the proposal in the third year of operation. This review would be submitted in the form of a formal recommendation to the Senate. Also no tenure track appointments would occur during that period. It also changed the course designations from History and English back to the Applied Professional Sciences' designations that I believe were originally in the proposal. We clarified the importance of continuing coordination between the College of Applied Professional Science faculty members who teach these courses and the faculty members who teach the courses in the regular departments. Lastly, specified that this is a nine-month opportunity for a student to demonstrate his or her capacity to succeed academically at Carolina. It is not an open ended opportunity for students to continue to take courses indefinitely.

In sum, this proposal presents a very controlled program. It is controlled in size (limited to 250 students) and it is controlled in curriculum. It is controlled in student progress in that students must take at least 30 hours in that first year and achieve a 2.0 grade point to continue at Carolina. It is the belief of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee that this proposal provides us with the most feasible alternative for addressing the three problems of our particular situation.

The CHAIR inquired if there was any discussion concerning the Faculty Senate Steering Committee's recommendation of the Provisional Year Program.

RONALD INGLE, ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES, spoke to the report:

In addition to the comments of the Steering Committee concerning the Provisional Year Program, I would like to make several additional points. In the meetings of committees and of the Board of Trustees which eventually led to phasing out the Associate Science degree programs at USC-Columbia two very basic points were paramount. Professor Ayres mentioned these - one is the concern for faculty tenured in these programs and two, concern for students who for many years used these programs as a springboard for entry into baccalaureate degree programs. The motion made at the April 14, 1983 meeting of the Board of Trustees asked the Administration to look into ways to preserve the opportunity that these two-year programs have provided the late blooming student and to give that student the opportunity to enter the University and to work his or her way into a four-year program - that is a quote from the minutes of that particular board meeting.

The proposal that is before you offers an opportunity for a portion of these students to enter the University of South Carolina. For the past five years, approximately 550 freshmen entered an associate degree program in the fall. This proposal would address only the top 45% of that population. The second concern is the principle of tenure. This program will allow the University to continue to benefit the tenured faculty who have been successful in working with such students in the past. Their tenure under this program will be protected. The
curriculum is rigorous and the expectations of student performance is high. In order for these students to succeed in baccalaureate degree programs the standards must be high. Much consideration has been given to the development of the proposal. It addresses the needs and continues to offer opportunity to a limited number of students who show academic potential and at the same time this program as presented to the Faculty Senate assures that the concept of tenure will be protected at the University of South Carolina.

PROFESSOR CHARLES McNEILL, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, stated that at the last faculty meeting of the College of Education the following resolution was passed:

"Resolved that the faculty of the College of Education supports the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to adopt the Provisional Year Program."

He added that he would therefore speak in favor of the motion.

PROFESSOR ROBERT PATTERSON, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, made the following comments:

Mr. Chairman, colleagues, I would like to address a few remarks to emphasize and perhaps accentuate some of the points Professor Ayres made. In the first place, I was in the position of asking this house in December to grant the Steering Committee the freedom to take a little bit more time to consider the problems associated with this proposal. My remarks should be taken in part as an expression of appreciation of the opportunity you all gave the Steering Committee. Secondly, I would like to make some remarks definitely in support of the proposal to reassure people who have some reservations about this proposal. The kind of ideas that I will briefly touch upon are both general and particular. First of all, the proposal that you have before you as you can see from Professor Ayres' presentation is markedly different from the proposal that was submitted to the Steering Committee back in November. So from your perspective I hope you are assured that the Steering Committee has taken its mandate seriously.

Secondly, regarding the merits of the proposal, I personally think many of you support the mission of the University to accentuate accessibility to the University while we try to promote higher standards for admission. We all know that the secondary school feeder system upon which we overwhelmingly rely for our undergraduate student body is a very heterogeneous and sometimes produces people who don't test so well. Therefore this kind of flexibility seems to me to both address the problem of the philosophical mission of this University as well as to help to renew and perpetuate a vibrant and sound undergraduate student population. I personally would like to recommend to this house that people resist the temptation to make a number of amendments. I say that remark with considerable reservation because it is certainly your right to do so. More specifically about the proposal, I would like to observe that it is a provisional one. As the proposal describes, it calls for monitoring by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and recommendations to be made as to its continuation or appropriate adjustments during the third year of its operation. Secondly, it is provisional in that it does not guarantee job security for the time being and it does not allow additions to the tenure-track personnel involved in it during the period which might be called probationary. In terms of its being a preliminary report, your endorsement of this proposal will allow the concerned faculty to work together. The ultimate provisional year will be the product of the interaction of the people in Applied Professional Sciences with other faculties regarding the amount of credit which can be transferred. So I would urge this proposal as something both preliminary and provisional but in the best interests of the University.
PROFESSOR WILLIAM McANINCH, LAW SCHOOL, spoke in opposition to the program as follows:

The stated purpose is to simply make available a university education to people who would not otherwise be admissible. I think that is an inappropriate purpose. The whole selling job of this multi-million dollar fund drive that we are engaged in had to do with the commitment to excellence and I think that is something that many of us have felt very strongly about for a number of years - a genuine commitment to excellence at this institution. I think that the proposed program is counterproductive to that. It seems to me that what it does is institutionalize the fact that about 10% of our freshman class is not going to succeed. I think that that can only have a debilitating effect on the educational opportunities of sophomore and subsequent courses as they do get through this program one way or another. There are other purposes than the one stated here as Professor Ayres matriculated and I would like to address several of those. Certainly there is very real concern about tenured members of the faculty whose departments seem to be disappearing. It seems to me that this proposal may in fact exacerbate that problem. It appears that no new tenure track appointments will be made. I don't see anything in this proposal that would preclude the award of tenure to persons untenured who are teaching during the next three years so this would mean even more tenured faculty three years from now when we will be trying to decide what to do with them.

In terms of the impact of this program for minority students at the University, as Professor Ayres pointed out the University seems to be doing fairly well across the board. There is quite a respectable percentage of minority students in most schools and colleges. I don't think this program is the way to get minority students here. I think the message that needs to be given to all students is not that there is a back door into the University but that there is just a front door and if you want to come here then you will have to work harder.

Finally the results of the very real problem of declining enrollments which impacts upon all of us in terms of reduced dollars to the whole University's operations. But I don't think that the way to attack the declining enrollment is to go down to the bottom. It seems to me that working on increasing the admission requirements will communicate genuine commitment to excellence. You may get applications from students who might be turned off by a school that seems to be working in contrary directions.

PROFESSOR CHARLES TUCKER, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, inquired if a tenured faculty member can lose his tenure after the third year of this program was discontinued and also can a non-tenured faculty member be given tenure while in this program.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER's response was no. He said that those who have tenure can lose it only in the ways specified in the Faculty Manual and this program does not alter the status of tenured members. He added that it does mean that there cannot be additional tenured members in this program.

PROFESSOR TUCKER then asked if new appointments that are made will be made on a yearly basis. The CHAIR responded that that was correct.

RONALD INGLE, ASSOCIATE DEAN, COLLEGE OF APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES, stated he would like to point out that no faculty involved in the program will be considered for tenure.

PROFESSOR TUCKER asked why the proposal states "that students who do not succeed in this program will not be allowed to come back to USC-Columbia" instead of "USC-Systems"?

The CHAIR responded that the Faculty Senate does not have jurisdiction over what is done elsewhere in the System. He added that our jurisdiction is limited to the Columbia campus and the two-year institutions, which are now designated as University campuses.
PROFESSOR RANDALL ENGLE, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, commented on the proposal as follows:

I have a couple of questions. The first is - it's not clear to me what really is the purpose of this proposal. Is it to allow students who otherwise would not be admitted to the University to be admitted? Is that the intent of the proposal? Or is it to provide jobs for our colleagues who are tenured in these programs which have been abolished? Is that the intent of the proposal? If so, then let's say that. No where in the goals does it say that. That is not an unreasonable goal. I am sure that if they were to abolish the Psychology Department I would consider something like this a reasonable goal to provide our faculty a means of support. Let's be honest about the goal here. I think we may find the discussion a little bit different if we try to be honest about the purpose of this proposal. Secondly, I would like to ask a question about the evaluation of the program. As a psychologist I am really concerned that when we say we are going to evaluate something whether it is going to be for therapy or for an academic program, let's say how we are going to evaluate it. Let's not leave it up to people that are charged to evaluate it. I would like to see some description of how the program is going to be evaluated.

RONALD INGLE, ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES, responded to his questions:

The answer to your first question is 'yes'. When the two year programs were eliminated, as I mentioned in my earlier remarks, the Board of Trustees asked the Administration to come up with a plan whereby most students who had formally used the two-year programs as a springboard into baccalaureate degrees could be accommodated. I should point out that I think it is between 1500-1600 students who are currently enrolled in baccalaureate degree programs at USC-Columbia came into those programs by associate degree programs. The second question was the question of tenured faculty. In my mind those were the two paramount issues as Professor Ayres has stated. As we went through this last spring each time we attempted to answer one of the questions the other question came up. One solution did not seem to address the other question and so consequently we kept coming back to a program which could answer both of those questions.

DEAN JOHN D. WAUGH, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, commented on the proposal as follows:

My comments are in support of the program. In a state like ours with the preparation our students are getting in the public school system and the questionable value of many testing procedures it appears to me that in the foreseeable future there will be a good number of South Carolinians who simply do not meet the entrance requirements due to space, budget, faculty, and other limitations. We have increasingly raised the requirements for direct admission to the College of Engineering as best as we can. We will choose to set the requirements to increase the possibility of success for the students that are admitted. Unfortunately, we have many examples of students we are excluding in previous years were admitted, graduated, and are eminently successful. We know no reasonable way to identify those students yet my conscience tells me we have an obligation to try to locate those people, but the College of Engineering alone cannot meet that obligation. The students that we are talking about here would not only be welcome but among the best students at many of the other colleges in this state. Having spent one year on one of those campuses, they are likely to have earned grades of 2.0 or better being among the best students on some of these campuses. They would then be free to transfer into each and every one of your majors. I would be every bit as comfortable having them earn a 2.0 and be admitted into each and every one of our majors through a program over which we have some control and some input as a program over which we had no control and no input. I would predict that most of the students so admitted will not be successful in terms meaningful for the
College of Engineering. We probably won't get them. I would also predict that some of the best students in our Engineering College to graduate in the next few years will come from that group.

PROFESSOR WARD BRIGGS, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES, stated that on page A-3 of the proposal it says that in addition to the projected GPR, another factor is that students may be admitted on high class ranks but low SAT scores, or high SAT's and low class ranks, or they may have neither of those but special talents such as music or art. He added that his question is, do I understand that, these are academic disciplines exclusively or would athletic prowess come under this?

PROFESSOR WHIT AYRES responded:

Any student admitted by the Admissions Committee in this program must predict at least a 1.75. We do not, however, anticipate simply ranking all applicants by a predicted grade point average and going down to 250 students. We prefer to look for some evidence of potential success and skip around within that group. That is the reason for those two criteria listed. Special talents in music or art would presumably raise the student in the estimation of the Admissions Committee. I am not convinced that the Athletic Department would want many of their football players in this program because of the requirement to take 15 hours in each of the two semesters and maintain a 2.0. That is going to be a firm requirement and indeed I think they might like a little more flexibility.

PROFESSOR DORIS ROYEM, COLLEGE OF NURSING, asked if this provisional program would take the place of the Opportunity Scholars and if so how would the criteria differ. The CHAIR stated that it would not take the place of the Opportunity Scholars.

JOHN BOLIN, DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS, also responded to her questions:

Opportunity Scholars Program deals with a limited population of economically deprived children that come from South Carolina. They are students whose parents have not had the opportunity for higher education and who rank in certain economic brackets. They are culturally and educationally deprived. We have already gone through our group of applicants so far and pulled out people who we would like to include in our review for the Opportunity Scholars. There is a very strict criteria for that program. The Provisional Year is broader than Opportunity Scholars.

PROFESSOR PATRICK SCOTT, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, reported as follows:

I am concerned about Professor Patterson's request that the program pass without amendment, because I want to raise a question about the details. I don't wish to question in a general way the compromise by the Steering Committee over the curriculum change (between the draft and final proposal) from departmental course numbers to PRSC courses but only to address the English requirements where I believe the compromise will cause difficulties.

The English Department has a well-established program of introductory courses required of students in all the colleges on campus. The College of Applied Professional Sciences has a different program, with different numbers, originally developed for students who aimed at two-year degrees; as Professor Ingle has pointed out, many of those students subsequently transferred into four-year colleges, but in each and every case, their PRSC English courses has to be accepted by their four-year college as substituting for the mandated graduation requirements, which are in every case English 101 and 102. The requirement, to take an English Department numbered course, is applied even to the approved curriculum for four-year degrees within the College of Applied Professional Sciences, though I understand there are still some four-year students there taking PRSC courses and counting them for English credit.
What concerns me is that in the long run we will, by the proposed Provisional Year curriculum institutionalize, and render permanent, these temporary and ad hoc substitutions for the regularly approved English curriculum. I want it to be clear that I am not questioning the original validity of PRSC courses for their designed purpose, and I am certainly not questioning the competence of PRSC faculty. It is a late stage at which to make any amendment, but the English Department never questioned the original (December) draft Provisional Year curriculum, and the Steering Committee's substitution of PRSC for departmental courses was made to satisfy other departments, not at our request.

What I propose is that the English component in the Provisional Year curriculum, taught by the PRSC provisional year faculty, should require designated sections of the regular English courses, under the course descriptions approved by the Senate as satisfying general education requirements for four-year degrees. If the students are being provisionally admitted with the goal of a four-year degree, they should be taking courses with the formal number and course description that is otherwise uniform throughout the University.

The CHAIR asked Professor Scott to repeat his motion.

PROFESSOR SCOTT repeated his motion as follows:

I would move that on page A-3 under Curriculum, Fall Semester, item 1, the present wording should be deleted and the following wording be inserted "ENGL 100p - Basic Writing" or ENGL 101p - Composition." Under Spring, item 1, the present wording should be deleted and the following substituted "ENGL 101p - Composition" or ENGL 102p - Composition and Literature."

PROFESSOR WARD BRIGGS, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES, seconded the motion.

The CHAIR asked if there was any discussion on the amendment to the motion.

PROFESSOR ROBERT PATTERSON, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, responded:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks responding on behalf of the Steering Committee. With respect to Professor Scott I share his concerns. I am not sure that I am able to respond to all the buttons which he pushed in the course of his remarks but I will try to do my best. In so far as being a member of the Steering Committee is concerned I can say that there is no idea in the back of the mind of the Steering Committee to create any kind of educational empire down in the College of Applied Professional Sciences. This is a very limited program and it has definite educational goals in mind. As far as a course designation is concerned we went around on this subject a number of times. We felt there were more problems raised by having the course designation parallel courses in English, history, psychology, and so on than if they were given titles and numbers that are appropriate to the College of Applied Professional Sciences. If a member of the English Department or a member of the History Department or any other department has a reservation about courses being taught in this particular program, they have every right according to this proposal to move the faculty of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences to withdraw its approval for the transferability of credit for the courses in question.
PROFESSOR PATRICK SCOTT, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, responded that Professor Franklin Ashley is here, and he has taught courses for our department as well as for his own college; he has done this without holding any rank or position in our department and without giving away at all his position as a full professor in the College of Applied Professional Sciences.

PROFESSOR CAROL CARLISLE, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, said that she did not understand Professor Patterson's comment that changing the PRSC designation for English courses to our numbers would cause problems in tenure and hiring, when we already use this sort of thing for the Opportunity Scholars Program; there a special suffix to designate the section of a 101 course taught specifically for Opportunity Scholars.

PROFESSOR ROBERT PATTERSON, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, responded to Professor Carlisle's question saying that it was simply our honest impression on the basis of conversations we have had with faculty members, our own membership in the University for a number of years, discussions that we have had on various committees that we served on and that we were trying to limit them to a minimum and to achieve that limitation.

The CHAIR stated that since there was no further discussion the Senate was then ready to vote on the amendment to substitute ENGL 100p or 101p for the fall semester and 101p or 102p in the spring. The amendment failed. CHAIRMAN WEASMER added that the Senate was now back to discussing the original proposal.

MARK HUSBAND, a graduate student in the Department of Chemical Engineering, asked to speak to the Senate. His remarks are as follows:

While it may seem that this issue doesn't really affect the general student body I have a few concerns and questions. Some of them have already been raised and the issue has been dealt with about the purpose of this proposal. Professor Ayres listed the three main objectives of this proposal. First of all, it would allow the tenured faculty to continue; secondly, it would help to increase minority enrollments, and thirdly, it would generate on the order of a million dollars if full formula funding is implemented by the state. I don't believe that those purposes are good enough reasons for implementing this program. I think that the adverse effects of this program are clear in that they admit students who otherwise would not be admissible to the University and therefore they obviously lower our standards and that affects me as a student considering that I graduated from the University of South Carolina.

In the last year we have heard so much about striving for excellence in education and eliminating needless courses and getting back to basics. I think it is important that we continue that. It seems to me that on the one hand we are striving for excellence and on the other hand we are adopting a lower standard for some students which I don't think we should do.

There are two other things I want to mention. One point that has not been brought up yet is that the Commission on Higher Education in the past few years decided that our General Studies Program was duplicative of other programs that are offered around the state and in this very city. It is not saying that these programs are bad as such. I believe in the good points about the associate degree programs and two-year programs and giving students who can't quite make the grade an opportunity for educational achievement in hopes that eventually they might go further or in hopes that the educational achievement they undertake will be beneficial to them. I think associate programs are great and like Dean Waugh said they contribute to the University in that people who otherwise might not be so beneficial to society can make a greater contribution. However, I believe that it is quite clear that for the University of South Carolina to have these sorts of programs is duplicative of the programs that are already available to these students all across the state. I think it should be pointed out that these students could quite easily get into any of USC's branch campuses. Not only that but despite South Carolina's poor education history we have one of the best technical college programs in the nation and we have junior college programs which would offer this class of
of students an opportunity for exactly what we are trying to offer. We have been told that these programs are a waste of the taxpayers' dollar and as a South Carolina taxpayer that is a concern of mine too.

The final point I want to raise (and this is pretty subjective since it is just my opinion) is in reference to the curriculum being offered in this program. The gentleman from Applied Professional Sciences gave a very good explanation of different selling points for this program but one of the things that I want to take issue with is his belief that this program has a rigorous nature. Just looking at this curriculum I don't believe that these kinds of things could be defined as "rigorous." It might be all that these students are capable of doing. However, the program to me is not rigorous. "Contemporary Issues" shouldn't be taught at a university, in my opinion. "The United States" sounds like a history course that is offered in the sophomore year of high school. I might be totally off base in my opinions about the Applied Professional Science courses, but I do not consider them rigorous. It doesn't look like we are trying to achieve excellence. It looks like we are offering courses that could be obtained elsewhere.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my views.

PROFESSOR JUDITH JOYNER, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, addressed the Senate as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I agreed with the Dean of Admissions of the University of California-Santa Cruz who expressed concern in several articles recently about the responsibility and roles particularly of great state universities not only to produce excellence which certainly is a responsibility but at the same time to make available the opportunity to those who might not meet a rigid statistical admission requirement that a university might set up. I think Professor Waugh said it very well that what we are concerned about is giving the opportunity to those who very well might succeed but who do not come up to the statistical admission numbers that we have. I am concerned as a tenured faculty member for other tenured faculty members. My support of this program is because I feel that there are students who will be excluded on the basis of a clue, and I feel that this does give us an opportunity to place some of those students who will make a great contribution to the state. If this is a great university, sir, it can afford to take a chance on 250 students.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, reported:

I find myself empathizing to a great extent with some of the remarks of this student and of Professors McAninch and Scott. On the other hand I just depart company with them on a couple of issues. A quick point I would like to reemphasize that has been brought up. First of all, I think we ought to have a happy respect for the work of the committee. They labored rather long and hard and when they come in with this kind of a report after a great deal of agony and it seems to me there ought to be a presumption that they knew what they were doing and this presumption at least ought to have some sway on our thinking.

The second point is that I wanted to emphasize again the rising reasons behind my support of this kind of a program is to do everything possible to prevent this University from getting into a situation where it has to fire tenured professors. That is a very serious thing for any university that has any pretensions of quality or anything else. As I understand, the College of Applied Professional Sciences sent out twenty-three notices last year to non-tenured faculty. This is a real genuine issue.
PROFESSOR NANCY LANE, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES, inquired if expansion of the Opportunity Scholars Program to accommodate the faculty in question was considered as one of the alternatives and if not, why not?

PROFESSOR AYRES responded that it was not considered and that perhaps someone more familiar with the Opportunity Scholars Program could speak to that issue.

THORNE COMPTON, ASSOCIATE DEAN, COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, responded as follows:

One thing is that the Opportunity Scholars Program is a federally funded program that works on a type of grant. It operates under standards that are set up partially by the University and partially through the integrating agency. It has a limited size. It is also created to meet a very specific need and does that superbly if you look at the way their students operate once they move out of that program. But it was not created as a general program but only to meet the people who had very specific economic and social disadvantages and I think that it might be a disservice to that program to load it up with other kinds of concerns.

PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM moved the previous question.

PROVOST BORKOWSKI stated he would like to address the proposal:

I would like to address a number of issues here. I think there is much merit for this sort of program. There are numerous universities and colleges that have similar kinds of programs - MIT, Indiana University. They are called different things but they have very similar kinds of provisions to handle students who may be gifted in one area but poor in another, (such as class standing or SAT's).

I can give you a number of examples but let me share with you one that underscores the fact that students may indeed require a provisional year. At Ohio University in 1969, the decision was made by the faculty to provide for students who failed in 1968-1969 all of their courses, in other words to wipe it clean, complete forgiveness, and invite them back in 1969-1970. Simply wipe their academic records clean. Approximately 170 students flunked out at the end of their 1969 academic year and were invited back. Out of 170 students, approximately 100 decided to come back and take advantage of that opportunity. Of the 100 that came back, roughly 33-35 failed again. Of that 100 that came back, 66 received their four-year degrees and 33 made it on the Dean's List. Of the 33, five were admitted to Law School and three were admitted to Medical School.

I think our Provisional Year Program maintains the criteria and the standard for admissions of the individual colleges while there is no relaxing of academic integrity. We have striven for excellence, tightened up the suspension policies and increased standards. But I think we also need to be very cognizant of the fact that there are some students who for whatever reason just miss the mark. I even know some people in high school who like to practice their musical instruments a lot and they have a tough time making it. If they don't succeed at the end of the thirty hours they will have to transfer elsewhere and if they do succeed they must meet the admissions standards of the college to which they apply. I think it is not unreasonable to give this opportunity to 250 students. Thank you very much.

The CHAIR stated that the previous question had been called. He added that in order to shut off any further debate a two-thirds vote was necessary. The CHAIR ruled that the motion was approved. CHAIRMAN WEASMER then asked the Senate to vote on the adoption of the Provisional Year as presented on the agenda. The Provisional Year Program was approved. The CHAIR emphasized that there will be continued monitoring of the program and an evaluation of it at a set point in time.
B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Robert Beamer:

On behalf of the Grade Change Committee, Professor Beamer moved the adoption of the Committee's report on pages A-6 through A-8 of the agenda. The report was adopted as submitted.

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

On behalf of the Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Pettus moved the adoption of the Committee's report with a few minor editorial changes. The report was adopted as edited.

IV. Report of Secretary.

SECRETARY DAVID D. HUSBAND reported to the Senate on the death of Professor Emeritus James Hubert Noland, Jr., of the College of Engineering. He added that a spray of flowers had been sent to the funeral from the faculty of the University of South Carolina.

V. Unfinished Business.

None.

VI. New Business.

PROFESSOR RUFUS FELLERS, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, read the following statement in recognition of Professor Noland's service to the University:

James Hubert Noland, Jr. was born on October 23, 1922 in Columbia, South Carolina and died on January 11, 1984. He is survived by his wife, Carrie David Noland, four daughters, and five grandchildren. Dr. Noland's funeral was held at the College Place Methodist Church, an institution to which he had given a lifetime of service as a member of the choir, the administrative board, lay leader, and as Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

He served in the U.S. Navy on the carrier U.S.S. Cowpens in the Pacific in World War II and retired from the Naval Reserve as a Commander in 1982. Always intensely interested in things nautical he was an ardent sailor and model builder as well as being a member of the Columbia Sailing Club, the Nautical Research Guild, and the Navy League of the United States.

More than two-thirds of Hubert's 61 years were spent on the campus of the University of South Carolina. He graduated from University High School which was housed in Wardlaw College, and received the Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from USC in 1942. He joined the faculty in January 1946 and has been a valued member of that body ever since.

He earned the Master's degree from Georgia Tech while on leave of absence in 1947-48 and the Doctor's degree from Yale Yale University in 1961 after two years leave of absence from USC. Dr. Noland was a member and officer of the honorary societies Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, Tau Beta Pi, and Eta Kappa Nu. A senior member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, he was named to receive the Institute's centennial medal for distinguished service.

Hubert Noland's service to the University of South Carolina was long and distinguished. He served as Department Chairman, Assistant Dean, Director of the Computer Center and on many University committees including the Faculty Advisory Committee of which he served as Chairman.
Dr. Noland was named as the first recipient of the Samuel Litman award for distinguished teaching in Engineering. This exemplifies Hubert's greatest contribution to USC and South Carolina. It was in the classroom that he stood tallest. Always known as demanding the highest standards of performance, his courses, required or elective, were always in great demand. The hundreds, even thousands of students who have sat in his classroom have been the principal beneficiaries of his long career.

Be it resolved that this body expresses its gratitude for the many years of dedicated and distinguished service which Dr. James Hubert Noland, Jr. has given to this University and to the State of South Carolina.

PROFESSOR FELLERS requested that this statement be included in the minutes and also that a copy of this be sent to his family.

The CHAIR hearing no objection to this request ordered that it be done.

VII. Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR SCOTT GOODE, CHEMISTRY, said that over the last 8 or 9 years the University of South Carolina at his request sent a small fraction of his very modest salary to the Variable Annuity Life Insurance Company who operates a University sponsored tax shelter annuity. He added that along with a statement of his deductions he also received a letter which stated that the company had decided to lower their rates which they had guaranteed on the deposits of earlier years. He added that although it was a small lowering in rates that these things tend to compound themselves and that in his case it works out to a decrease of $105,600.89 in his annuity at age 65. He requested that the Faculty Welfare Committee examine this issue.

The CHAIR requested Professor Goode to make a formal motion.

PROFESSOR GOODE made a motion to have the Faculty Welfare Committee examine this issue of decrease in the interest rates of VALIC's tax shelter annuity program.

The motion was seconded and approved.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, stated he would like to call to the Senate's attention the deaths of Professor Don Galgano of the College of Pharmacy and also Rutledge Osborne, former Chairman of the Board of Trustees. PROFESSOR MOORE said he would like to make some remarks in honor of Mr. Rutledge:

When I first came here in 1958, Rut was the Chairman of the Board and those were the days when the Birch nuts were running all over the state, the Klu Klux Klan was still lurking about, and there were assorted kooks of all varieties around here. It didn't take me long among others to get into trouble. It was the constant demands of being fired and things like that and I soon found out Mr. Rut as we called him was found to be a pretty decent sort of a man, a good defender of the University, and even as a Trustee, he had some vague idea of what academic freedom was all about. Over the years, I came to respect him quite a lot and I must confess I was rather sad to see him go. I think he really did make a contribution to making this University the semi-civilized place that it is today.

PROFESSOR GLENN ABERNATHY, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, said that having been on this faculty for a number of years and watching the high points and the low points of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate operations that he simply would like to applaud the performance of the Faculty Senate on its high level discussions which was made on this important matter that we discussed today.
VIII. Announcements.

The CHAIR asked if there was any further nominations for the one semester vacancy on the Curricula and Courses Committee. There being none, Professor Shirley Kuiper, College of Business Administration, was declared elected.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.