

MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF DECEMBER 7, 1983

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

I. Correction of Minutes of November 2, 1983.

PROFESSOR COLIN BENNETT, MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, reported as follows corrections to his comments concerning freshman admission requirements:

On page M-9, the fourth paragraph, I believe that the sense of what I said was slightly different than what is recorded here. The fourth paragraph begins "Now, if this is the State Board of Education's minimum set of requirements, I suppose we could change that", I believe that what I said was "I suppose we cannot change that." The beginning of the following sentence "In other words" would be more appropriate I believe to be changed to "On the other hand." And there is one on the following page, page M-10, the sentence which reads, "I have included trigonometry because it is our admission requirement into the calculus series." While we require our students to learn about series and sequences I think that "sequence" would be more appropriate than series.

The CHAIR asked if there were any objections to these corrections. There being none, the Minutes were approved as corrected.

II. Report of Officers.

A. President James B. Holderman:

Thank you, Dr. Weasmer. I am delighted to be here. I realize I am tempting fate to say that we have gotten through a year without firing a coach. We were pleased to hear Athletic Director Marcum's announcement that Joe Morrison's contract has been extended another year.

I want to share with you a letter I received last week because in many ways it sums up my responsibilities here at Carolina. It is from a young lady in Gastonia, North Carolina and it said: (This is an honest to God letter by the way).

Dear sir:

I am very interested in locating a gentleman by the name of Chuck who is attending your University. All that I know is that he is from Gaffney. Your help would be deeply appreciated. Could you please send me a list of all the Chucks you have enrolled this year or better yet if you can find the Chuck from Gaffney? Thank you.

My guess is that after sober consideration by the appropriate senior administrators his name was probably not Chuck and he probably did not go to the University of South Carolina and nor was he from Gaffney and she will probably never hear from him again. It was probably a great weekend.

On a more serious plane, let me bring you up to date on the budget which is always of interest to you for obvious reasons. The Ways and Means Committee has begun its hearings. There is new revenue available this year of about \$210,000,000. The chances of

full-formula funding are good to excellent but there is going to be a lot of work that needs to be done in the interim. It wouldn't surprise me a bit if the House were to increase the Budget and Control Board's recommendation for Higher Education by approximately \$10-\$12,000,000 and the balance of \$14,000,000 (to fully fund the formula) would be done in the Senate. There are some people who would carve into the one cent sales tax to accomplish the funding of the formula but we have not felt it to be a good idea to get involved in that particular controversy or discussion. I think it is far too early to tell what the future of that one cent sales tax is going to be anyway and I don't think anybody in the University family nor indeed any of the other colleges and universities want to tie our formula funding argument to the one cent sales tax question. Admittedly, if the one cent sales tax is passed there would be a substantial amount of relief upon the general revenue of the state but that is not a discussion that we want to engage in at this time. We are committed as is the Commission on Higher Education to seeing the formula fully funded for the first time in five years. It would mean about \$12,000,000 to the University of South Carolina - \$26,000,000 total and that would be a tremendous assistance to the entire University System. We will do everything in our power that is essentially ethical and humanly possible to see that accomplished over the next few months.

We had planned to bring to the Board a new draft of Carolina Plan III detailing the mission of the University at the Board's December meeting but frankly it got away from us and not all the bases could be touched that needed to be touched in the time possible and we have delayed the draft until February at the earliest or more likely April. It will deal in large part with the mission of the University of South Carolina on its several campuses with a natural attention of a preponderant nature to the Columbia campus building on the speech I made at the General Faculty meeting in September, but also acknowledging the special responsibility we have as the major state university in the State where public education is under serious attack to meeting the needs of a broad constituency. I wanted to keep you informed of the development of that plan and as you know your Academic Forward Planning Committee will be continually involved in its development.

If there are any questions from the floor about any subject I would be happy to answer them at this time.

If I don't see all of you before holiday time, I do hope you have a thoroughly enjoyable Christmas and a very prosperous New Year. Thank you very much.

B. Provost Francis T. Borkowski:

I have just one comment to make and that is that the Faculty Manual is ready to go to the printers. All the reviews have been done by the various committees and the Faculty Advisory Committee reviewed the final draft and it will be presented tomorrow to the Academic Affairs Committee and the Faculty Liaison Committee of the Board of Trustees. If all goes well we should have a new Faculty Manual in your hands sometime in January. There is a copy of the Manual in draft form in the Faculty Senate Office.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER asked if there were any other reports from officers. There being none, the CHAIR moved to Reports of Committees.

III. Reports of Committees.

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

Part of my report pertains to a matter that has been brought to the Steering Committee. We have been looking at a proposed "Provisional Year Program" which had been presented to several

other committees, but the Steering Committee is not yet ready to offer a specific proposal. Our committee voted to approve the "goals of the Provisional Year Program" but we felt that there were several areas of the proposal which needed more attention and the Steering Committee will bring that proposal to the Senate at our next regularly scheduled meeting which is currently scheduled for February. We have already had several special meetings in which we received reports from various concerned committees on this matter and we have a third special meeting called for tomorrow morning at 8:30 to further consider the matter and it is my understanding that Ron Ingle, Steve Ackerman, and John Bolin will attend this meeting. This report is for your information.

The other matter which I wish to bring up is on your agenda page A-1. The Senate Steering Committee moves that the Chairman of the Athletic Advisory Committee be added to the Steering Committee as a permanent member.

The CHAIR explained that this would be a change on page 21 of the Faculty Manual and inquired if there was any discussion of this motion.

PROFESSOR ROBERT ROOD, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, asked if there was any requirement in the by-laws of the committee (since it is a mixed committee of students, faculty, and administrators) that the chairman be a faculty member.

The CHAIR responded that the requirement was in the Faculty Manual.

There was no further discussion. The motion to include the chairman of the Athletic Advisory Committee as a permanent member of the Steering Committee carried.

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

PROFESSOR COLLISON moved the adoption of the Committee's report on page A-2 of the agenda. The report was adopted as submitted.

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

PROFESSOR PETTUS stated he would like to amend his committee's report by withdrawing item III, College of Journalism, on pages A-3, A-4, and the top of page A-5. He added that he spoke to representatives of the College of Journalism and there will be some additional changes made on this and it will be presented again at another time. CHAIRMAN PETTUS then asked for the Senate's approval on items I and II on page A-3 and item IV, page A-5.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER asked if there was any discussion.

PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE, JOURNALISM, inquired if there was any particular reason for upper casing "jazz" in the description of THSP 379 INTERMEDIATE JAZZ DANCE. He added that it seemed that the lower case should be used.

The CHAIR asked if this editorial change was acceptable to the committee.

PROFESSOR PETTUS stated that it was acceptable.

There being no further discussion or debate, sections I, II, and IV of the report was adopted with the editorial change to THSP 379.

D. ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE, Professor Q. Whitfield Ayres, Chair:

PROFESSOR AYRES called the Senate's attention to the catalog statement on freshman admissions as approved by the Faculty Senate on November 2, 1983 (Minutes, page M-19). He added he had no further report at this time.

E. Faculty House Board of Governors, Professor Richard Conant:

PROFESSOR CONANT presented the Faculty House Board of Governors' Annual Report which is on pages A-6, A-7, and A-8 of the agenda. He asked if there were any questions or comments concerning the report. There were none.

IV. Report of Secretary.

No report.

V. Unfinished Business.

None.

VI. New Business.

PROFESSOR SUZANNE STROMAN, COLLEGE OF APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES, said that a week ago she sent a letter to the Faculty Senators regarding the "Provisional Year Program" and that at this time she would like to move that the "Provisional Year Program" be adopted.

PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM, seconded the motion.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER stated:

According to the provisions of the Faculty Manual, the Senate shall not give consideration to any substantive legislative matters not included on the published agenda of the meeting at which it is introduced, unless by a two-thirds vote the Senate shall agree to consider such matters. This is a substantive legislative matter. It is not on the published agenda. Therefore in order for it to be considered at this time a two-thirds vote is necessary. All discussion should be confined to the issue of whether or not to consider it at this time.

PROFESSOR CHURCHILL CURTIS, COLLEGE OF APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES, called for a point of order. He then stated he would like to appeal the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIR responded:

I am sorry, as far as the Chair is concerned to allow an appeal would be to allow you to do by the appeal process what you cannot do by the Manual process. It is my reading of the Manual that a two-thirds vote is required to consider substantive legislative matters and my reading of parliamentary rules is that you cannot overturn this by formal appeal which would allow you to accomplish by a simple majority that which the Manual specifies as requiring a two-thirds majority. Therefore in this instance the Chair will not entertain an appeal. Do you wish once more to present at this time a motion to consider the Provisional Year?

PROFESSOR STROMAN responded that she was asking for a motion that the "Provisional Year Program" be considered at this time and adopted.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER responded that the motion to consider at this time would require a two-thirds vote.

PROFESSOR FRANKLIN ASHLEY, COLLEGE OF APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES, responded that he thought his colleague was appealing the Chair's decision to rule it substantive - it is important but not substantive.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER answered:

It is the opinion of the Chair that it is substantive. It does deal with a matter of substance which is defined by the dictionary as being important and significant. Once more I sympathize with what you are trying to do and I do not wish

to be more obdurate than I normally am but my feeling is that if the appeal is allowed, then you may overturn any portion of the Manual which requires more than a majority vote by using the appeal process. Thus in this instance I am afraid I must say the appeal will not be entertained. What is in order is a motion to consider and therefore it requires a two-thirds vote. The debate therefore is confined to the issue of "shall the body at this time take up this proposal."

PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM, said, "Correct me if I am incorrect on this, are we then not allowed the luxury of an appeal?"

The CHAIR responded:

There are in Roberts' Rules certain occasions under which the appeal may be disregarded and one of the occasions is when the purpose of the appeal is to set aside normal statutory requirements. I will say once more what this does is to say that the normal requirement of the two-thirds vote cannot be set aside by appealing the ruling of the Chair. If this were allowed then this could apply to any other situation where more than a majority vote is required.

PROFESSOR PRICE said he thought that the issue involved was the Chair's particular ruling that this was indeed a substantive matter.

The CHAIR responded that substantive by normal definition is "that which has substance" and he thought this fell within that category.

PROFESSOR PRICE answered that he thought that the definition was what was being questioned here.

The CHAIR said he thought the matter could be settled if the body wished to consider the matter at this time it could do so with a two-thirds vote.

PROFESSOR PRICE said that he believed that the issue was that an appeal of the Chair could be supported by a simple majority vote whereas "to consider" this matter will require a two-thirds majority. This is a major difference.

The CHAIR responded that was quite true but that what he was saying was that you cannot overturn the two-thirds requirement by a majority vote.

PROFESSOR PRICE added that we could overturn the definition of substantive issue.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER said he would not entertain an appeal concerning that definition.

PROFESSOR PRICE said he was not sure that the Chair had the right to decline to entertain an appeal if the body desired to overrule it.

The CHAIR stated the body was not entitled to overrule provisions of the Manual or the by-laws.

PROFESSOR PRICE said they were entitled to overrule the Chair's interpretation of those things and that was what was in question.

The CHAIR stated as follows:

If the effect of overruling the interpretation is as a matter of fact to overrule the provisions of the Manual then it is quite properly ruled out of order. You propose a device whereby in the appeal process you set aside the requirement of the two-thirds vote. Therefore you can say that any issue which can get a majority vote becomes non-substantive and can be voted upon immediately.

PROFESSOR PRICE said that he certainly did not agree with the Chair.

PROFESSOR WEASMER answered:

With sincere respect with those who disagree with me and without trying to impute anything to anyone I feel I must stick with this in order to maintain the integrity of the by-laws concerning the published

agenda. The purpose of this is to make certain that what is a subject for debate is known in advance to all interested parties. The agenda does not go only to members of the Senate. It is also available to all members of the faculty, the administration, and others who are entitled to be present at this gathering and are entitled to speak. The purpose of the published agenda is to allow that everyone knows in advance what is to be discussed. Therefore I am afraid I must stick to the ruling that the appeal is not in order. What is in order is a motion to consider at this time. Is there a second?

PROFESSOR JUDITH JOYNER, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, seconded the motion.

The CHAIR asked for discussion of the matter.

PROFESSOR JOYNER responded:

I am a member of the University Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee. This issue was discussed at several meetings of that committee and in fact the majority of that committee voted to have this matter brought before the Faculty Senate. We did have a letter from Professor Stroman to the faculty and I received it about the time I received the agenda of this meeting. I feel that it is important. I feel it has been discussed by several committees. I feel that it is a matter that needs to be addressed at this time and I urge you to permit the Senate to discuss this matter.

PROFESSOR EDWARD GREGG, HISTORY, stated:

I am the Chairman of the Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee of which Professor Joyner assists. We did vote by a narrow majority (three in favor, two against and one member absent) in favor of the Provisional Year. Our report however was not to be submitted to the Faculty Senate but to be submitted to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee which, as Professor Husband pointed out, has this matter actively under consideration and is trying to deal with proper alternatives. Therefore, I would suggest that there is no real reason for rushing this through at this meeting, doing a kind of end-run around the established constitutional and committee procedures of the Senate.

PROFESSOR FRANKLYN BOLANDER, BIOLOGY, said that he agreed with the Chairman that this was a most substantive issue. He added that he did not even know it was in the offing until a week ago but that the Biology Department did manage to have a departmental meeting. He said there were various aspects of this proposal that the Department felt was very loose and needed more work on it. He said that since the Steering Committee was already working on it and will have a proposal by the February meeting that he would like to have more time to look it over and that he would especially like to see the recommendations of the Steering Committee.

PROFESSOR GALE COSTON, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIVE DISORDERS, called for the question.

The CHAIR stated that once more he was going to be difficult in that he didn't want to cut off discussion prematurely. He added that therefore he would not hear the call for the question in order to allow for other points of view.

PROFESSOR PERRY ASHLEY, JOURNALISM, commented:

I am confused. I am wondering how the Steering Committee is getting between the properly elected committees of this Senate. Apparently the Scholastic Standards Committee did take some action on this and now it is in the hands of the Steering Committee to either approve or disapprove this action being brought to this body. It is my understanding that any of the standing committees properly elected brought their business directly to this body and here again I am confused. I don't know why the Steering Committee is involved in this.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER responded as follows:

As far as the committees are concerned, my recollection is that the Admissions Committee has approved the admissions portion of what was presented to them as a "Provisional Year Program" and did not approve anything beyond that. Apart from an endorsement in principle of the idea, their precise approval has been in terms of the admissions aspect. The chairman of that committee was not instructed to present the report at this meeting so in that sense there has been no delay by him or anyone else of their report. As indicated by the Chairman of the Scholastic Standards Committee, this is a matter which was sent to them at the request of the Steering Committee on the grounds that the Provisional Year Program was of relevance not just to the Admissions Committee but to several other committees and therefore they should likewise look at it. If they chose to take action they could and if they chose not to act that likewise is their decision. Their decision was to take action but not in terms of a recommendation to the Faculty Senate but a recommendation to the Steering Committee. Likewise the Committee on Curricula and Courses was asked by the Steering Committee to look at the "Provisional Year Program" and therefore their recommendations were made to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee has not in any way taken from the Admissions Committee or the Academic Forward Planning Committee any prerogatives. They were perfectly free to present this proposal to the Faculty Senate. Admissions chose not to present it. The Academic Forward Planning Committee voted to reject the Provisional Year. The involvement of the Steering Committee was to promote some type of collective consideration of a rather complex matter. The chairmen of all the committees referred to are members of the Steering Committee and participated in the decision that the Steering Committee should look at this Provisional Year proposal. This was a way of coordinating and harmonizing what has been rather piecemeal approval. As indicated in the Secretary's report there has been substantial sympathy for certain goals of the program. That did not mean that all the committees looking at it agreed on the precise mechanism for realizing those goals. Rather than having something defeated because so many things fall between the cracks, the Steering Committee has served as a coordinating committee. Steering thought we ought to look at this and to try to work out some sort of conciliation rather than adopting an attitude of take it or leave it, approve it or disapprove it. Steering has not taken anything from another committee, it has not in any way tried to prevent a committee from handling or reporting anything on its own. Therefore nothing has been kept off the agenda by the action of the Steering Committee. Is there any other discussion concerning consideration at this time of the Provisional Year?

PROFESSOR CHARLES TUCKER, SOCIOLOGY, said he would urge the Senate to not approve of this at least at the present time for three reasons: First, no one else in my department knows about this. They were not informed of this. Only the Senators were informed and they have a number of questions about it and my department would like to receive the proposal before they recommend to us any action that we might take. Secondly, I have discussed several aspects of this proposal with the people who are apparently lobbying for it and find that things that they mentioned to me are not in fact in the proposal, and third, I would like to have the recommendations of the Steering Committee on this proposal.

PROFESSOR JUDITH JOYNER, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, said that the information that she had received from the Chairman of the Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee was that the Steering Committee had rejected it and not that they were going to further consider it. She added that this had some bearing on her attitude toward their taking it up. She then asked if it remained in the Faculty Senate Steering Committee what is the authority of the Steering Committee with respect to the proposal - would they have the authority to reject it and if they reject it and the matter did not come before the Senate, would the Senate have the right to consider it even though the Steering Committee may not approve of it.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER responded:

If the Steering Committee does not approve of the program in any way, shape or form, then the matter would not be placed on the agenda by the Steering Committee. It would then be perfectly in order for any of the committees which have handled this to present to the Faculty Senate whatever program that particular committee deems to be appropriate. Likewise a member of the Senate can put an item on the agenda as specified in the by-laws of the faculty. But as indicated by the Secretary, the Steering Committee rejected a particular proposal, but it approved the goals of the Program and felt that certain problems needed to be addressed before it was presented to the Senate. It would be much simpler if there was a flat negative and that was the end of the matter. There is an attempt to come up with an alternative which may or may not be better. As far as the Steering Committee is concerned there are a number of different ways of achieving the particular goals and the Committee would like to look at some of these alternatives. There is nothing to prevent any of the committees which handled it independently from coming up with their own independent report or recommendation. This could always be put on the agenda by either of the committees subsequently or by an interested party.

PROFESSOR ROBERT PETTUS, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULA AND COURSES,
responded as follows:

What I have to say is not as close to the topic of shall we discuss it. I would like to raise a point that has to do with the access of information. One of the committees which has indeed looked at this is the Curricula and Courses under the direction of the Steering Committee. All of the information which the members of the committee were given has been put on paper and the summary has been made in each case of the meeting of the results and a summary was passed around to each member so that they could comment on it and in fact we gave a written summary of our feelings to the chairman of the Senate. All of these pieces of paper are in the Faculty Senate Office and I see no reason why they couldn't be available to anyone who would like to see it and I realize that is not a convenient way of seeing things but I think it is very appropriate for you to know that all of the deliberations of the committee are indeed on record and are available. I cannot speak for the committee because I am not a member of the Senate and I did not know this was going to come up today and it would be inappropriate for me to have any opinion without being able to consult with my committee. But I will make it very clear to you that all of the results of the prior deliberations have been put on paper and they are available to any member of the Senate or any member of the University.

PROFESSOR ROBERT PATTERSON, HISTORY, said:

I don't want to be in the position of repeating some of the remarks that the Chair has made to our colleagues but I certainly would urge them to vote against this motion. I don't think the Chair should be overturned unless there are very compelling reasons. The reason why the Senate Steering Committee has taken this matter under its consideration is that a number of committees have come to varying conclusions about it. There was the rejection of the proposal as it was presented by one major planning committee - Academic Forward Planning Committee. By definition of the very nature and function of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee as is stated in the Faculty Manual when matters concern the competencies of various committees, as this proposal does, it is entirely appropriate and proper for the Senate Steering Committee to take this under consideration. From my own perspective as a member of that committee, I can assure this house that there is no sentiment or any plan, collectively or even individually, to use a "time for study" to prevent this University from coming to grips with this very serious issue. It is the desire of the Senate Steering Committee to formulate the best possible alternative that reasoned thinking can produce and I think we should support the Chair and allow time for the best alternative to be presented.

PROFESSOR ROBERT ROOD, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, urged the Senate to reject the motion to consider at this time for two reasons. One, the proposal needs to be put in print for every faculty member to read, not just members of the Senate. Under the Senate rules, any member of the faculty can come and speak, thus the general faculty has not had an opportunity to see this proposal in writing. Second, he said he was aware that some Senators have not seen Professor Stroman's letter or a copy of the proposal. He added he did not think it was appropriate to consider this issue until the Steering Committee presented their proposal.

PROFESSOR RICHARD MANDELL, HISTORY, said he had to speak to this matter because it was particularly vivid to him as a member of this History Department. He said that many of these courses that will be taught are history courses - History 101, 102, and 110 (I teach History 102). He added he was going to use this occasion to say that he really didn't want people who were not historians to teach a course that he regularly teaches. Also he said the History Department received this proposal with a great deal of consternation, and that he was instructed by his full department without exception to express "shock and dismay" at this proposal. He added that he thought that more information was needed.

The CHAIR emphasized once again that comments should not address the merits of the proposal but what is in order is the question to consider or not to consider the proposal at this time.

PROFESSOR FRANKLIN ASHLEY, COLLEGE OF APPLIED PROFESSIONAL SCIENCES, said he thought the passion of Mr. Mandell's remarks were connected to why we should consider it today because there are people here who have looked at this proposal and we have got to press on and that he would like to be able to engage Mr. Mandell in a discussion of this issue and also to answer some of the comments that were raised.

PROFESSOR JIM PATTERSON, THEATRE AND SPEECH, said he would like to formally move the previous question.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER said that since the question had already been raised and was being raised again that he felt he was bound to go ahead and allow the question to be put now. He said the question was, "Should debate be terminated on the motion to consider this proposal?" The motion to terminate debate passed. The Senate then moved to the question of consideration of the motion from the floor to consider the proposal. He reminded the Senate that approval of this motion required a two-thirds majority. The CHAIR asked Professor Glenn Abernathy, Government and International Studies, and Professor Ed Mercer, College of Science and Mathematics, to serve as tellers. He added that if the motion passed it would then be in order to discuss the motion presented from the floor which could be passed by the normal majority vote. After a show of hands, the motion to consider failed by a vote of 43-60. (i.e. 43 voted to consider and 60 voted not to consider).

The CHAIR inquired if there was any other new business.

PROFESSOR ROBERT ROOD, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, said that for approximately six or seven years the University has been using the predicted GPR for admissions purposes. He said that he had talked to Professor Ayres, Chairman of the Admissions Committee, and noted that there were some problems of reliability. He requested that the Admissions Committee examine how well the predicted GPR has served us in the past.

The CHAIR asked Professor Rood if he was presenting a motion.

PROFESSOR ROOD said no that he was requesting that the committee look into this.

The CHAIR responded in the absence of a motion he would move on to any other new business. There was no other new business.

VII. Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR BARBARA TENENBAUM, HISTORY DEPARTMENT, said that she was requested by her department to read the following statement to the Senate and to ask for comments on it:

This motion was passed by the History Department and then it was emodied in a letter which was sent by our Chair, Dr. George Rogers, and to the Provost, and to Director of Libraries, Mr. Toombs.

It is the sense of the Department of History at the University of South Carolina that:

Research and publication are major functions and concerns of the faculty of the University of South Carolina. Therefore, it is critically important that all libraries of the University be open throughout the calendar year and that the University Libraries and their excellent staff be given the support they need and deserve. In particular, library facilities should be open between semesters, and when open, operate longer hours during those interim periods than has been the practice in recent years.

We received a very prompt response from the Provost concerning this matter. One of the answers to it was the fact that we have longer hours scheduled for the Christmas holiday and the Provost noted to us that attendance at the Library and useage will be closely monitored during that time. Therefore it is the wish of the History Department to urge you and members of the community, visiting relatives, and find people to come to the library during those hours so as to raise the totals and keep the library open as long as possible. The Provost also added that in spite of our concern for all libraries that this would apply to Thomas Cooper Library only and the other libraries will have to set their hours as they wish.

Members of the History Department would like to heartily thank the Provost for his very prompt reply and also Mr. Toombs. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER asked if there were any further comments under Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR CHARLES TUCKER, SOCIOLOGY, said that his department was unanimously asking Senators to lodge a complaint about the pre-registration process which requires students to miss classes. He added that the Sociology Department, despite what people might think, would like to have students attend its classes so we object to the pre-registration process which requires students to be absent from our classes and we hope that this problem would be solved in the future.

The CHAIR replied that he thought these remarks as well as the remarks of Professor Rood should be put in writing and addressed to a faculty committee or to the administration to look into this.

CHAIRMAN WEASMER asked if there were any further comments under Good of the Order. The CHAIR said he thought that in this respect he would say in light of the previous discussion in which the Chair made some rather unpleasant and unpopular rulings that he appreciated the lack of rancor with which this was received. He added he thought there had been a commendable tone which had not become unduly bellicose, vindictive or the like and that he was personally appreciative of it.

VIII. Announcements.

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:58.