MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF APRIL 6, 1983

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. by Chairman Robert B. Patterson.

I. Approval of Minutes.

The following corrections were made to the Minutes of March 2, 1983:

1. Page M-5, in the report of the Grade Change Committee, paragraph 1, line 5, "past four semesters" should read "past fall semester".
2. Page M-9, the reference of the poetry of "T.S. Elliott" should read "T.S. Eliot".
3. Page M-10 in the remarks of Professor Donald Weatherbee, paragraph 1, "meaning" should read "emotion".

The Minutes were approved as corrected.

II. Reports of Officers.

The CHAIR requested and obtained the consent of the house to allow the Provost to make his remarks at a later time in the meeting because he had been delayed by pressing University business elsewhere.

The CHAIR informed the Senate that following the March Senate meeting he received a letter from the Chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee requesting a General Faculty meeting of the University be called regarding the matter of the possibility of faculty furloughs. In turn, the CHAIR had conveyed this request to the President with the qualification that although this request from Faculty Welfare did not technically meet the requirements of the Faculty Manual, the CHAIR was certain that the President would want to respect this request. Simultaneously, optimistic reports from state government officials regarding an improvement in the fiscal situation made it appear that furloughs were probably not going to be necessary and hence the CHAIR informed the Senate that he had advised the President to "give assurances that in the future if a furlough policy might be necessary that a faculty meeting might be called and that would certainly satisfy Faculty Welfare's request". The CHAIR indicated that he had received a positive response from the President and that this had been conveyed to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

The CHAIR introduced the University's new Head Football Coach, Joe Morrison who addressed the Senate as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and we appreciate the opportunity to talk with you about the University of South Carolina football program today. First, I want to pass along a few comments about where I was previously and that was at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, New Mexico. When we went into the University it was under a very dark cloud as far as the NCAA is concerned and primarily the basketball scandal. In a period of about my first six weeks in Albuquerque we spent our time talking to various university investigative agencies, state investigative agencies, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the NCAA. So after going through all that, needless to say, our Athletic Department and in particular the football and basketball programs were under very close scrutiny not only by the faculty members and by the Administration but also by our Athletic Department. The point I am trying to make is we are very accustomed after our three years out there to running a very clean, honest, and legitimate type program and I want to pass that along to you today. That is strictly the type of program that we want to run here at the University of South Carolina.
Just a few thoughts on the educational aspects of our football program... I know that you hear and read a lot about universities and the athletic programs taking advantage of the student athletes coming out of high school. Well, it is my personal belief and I think the belief of everyone on our football staff that our first purpose in recruiting that young man is from an educational viewpoint. I think that we have to, in fairness to the young man whom we recruit, first, upgrade academically our recruiting program and we intend on doing that and we will be doing that this coming year. Secondly, we feel once we receive that young man on campus we have an obligation to him from an educational viewpoint. We have academic advisors; we have tutorial programs; and we are going to do everything that we can with those areas to see that the young men do have a great opportunity to receive their education and to receive their degree.

Maybe I can pass along a little story to you that points this out a little more clearly and that is I really had the pleasure and the opportunity of playing professional football for 14 years and during that time with the New York Giants I saw a lot of people come and go through training camp. It's always interesting to look back and find some of those individuals. The ones that received their college education and received their college degree are doing very, very well. The ones that went to college with the thought of becoming a professional football player and then having the opportunity to go to training camp and then either not staying through training camp or staying in the NFL for a period of maybe only one year without a degree have a very difficult time making that transition after they are released by an NFL team and most of those people are not doing very well today. A very small percentage of our people are going to have the opportunity to go into either the NFL or the United States Football League. Even if they do the average is four years. So I think that is all the more reason it is our responsibility as coaches to see that we do everything that we can from the motivational aspect to see that our young men work hard, attend class, receive their education and obtain their degree because it is going to be so beneficial and so useful to them later on in life. We have a class attendance form that our coaches or our players fill out every Friday afternoon. We want to know if they are attending class and it brings them and the coach in contact so we do have the opportunity to talk about academics and how they are doing and we do place a great deal of importance upon this. I wanted to share that and pass it along to you as kind of our theory, philosophy, and beliefs as far as how important the educational process is to our student athletes. If you have any questions I would be most happy to answer them.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, expressed his appreciation to Coach Morrison for his visit and commented that in his twenty-five years at the University this was the first time an athletic coach had ever addressed a faculty meeting. PROFESSOR MOORE also commented that he had seen Coach Morrison play for the New York Giants which led him to conclude that "if you can coach as you play we ought to be in damn good shape". PROFESSOR MOORE also had three questions for Coach Morrison: 1. "Are we in the recruitment of our football players using the same entrance requirements for football players as we are for our normal students?" 2. "Do you have plans to increase the graduation rate of our student athletes . . . ?" and 3. "Do you have any feelings about the continued utility of athletic dormitories?" COACH MORRISON responded that to his knowledge "yes we are using the same admission standards in the Athletic Department as any other student coming into the University of South Carolina." In response to Professor Moore's second question, COACH MORRISON spoke again about his desire to recruit better student athletes because "their chances of remaining in school are much better" and because "they are a lot easier to coach". Finally, COACH MORRISON stated that he felt "very comfortable" with respect to the athletic dormitory and he elaborated that "from a discipline control factor it is much easier and better than having them scattered either throughout the community or throughout the campus and, Harold White, our academic advisor, has his office right there".
PROFESSOR GLENN ABERNATHY, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, requested Coach Morrison to verify the authenticity of a report that Professor Abernathy claimed to have received "to the effect that the Athletic Department at Clemson is in great difficulty with the Internal Revenue Service . . . . it seems that they have neglected to give their players their W-2 forms". In turn, COACH MORRISON took this occasion to convey to the Senate his own Clemson story as follows:

When we released our list of signees to the newspaper they immediately printed our list of signees in the paper on Thursday morning after signing day. I was looking at the paper and I saw our list and over in the next paragraph it said that Clemson's signees would be released in two weeks. So I went into our Athletic Director, Bob Marcum, and said "Bob, I don't understand. We release our signees immediately and they put those in the paper and I see where Clemson is not going to release their signees for two weeks. Would you have a reasonable explanation for that?" He said, "Sure, they are just waiting for the checks to clear."

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, shared his lamentation about the University's withdrawal from the ACC and requested Coach Morrison to give his assessment of the utility of conference affiliation for the success of his program. COACH MORRISON responded as follows:

I think at some institutions and the one that I was at earlier, the University of New Mexico, conference affiliation is necessary. I think when you look at the University of South Carolina the tremendous interest, enthusiasm and support that its football program receives, it is not necessary to belong to a conference. The bad thing about not belonging to a conference as far as I am concerned and your young men are concerned is they do miss out on conference offensive player of the week and conference defensive player of the week. But since you asked about conferences, with the type of schedule that we have here, if they play well at all they will receive all the recognition they truly deserve. Plus if we belong to a conference you would not probably have the opportunity to play Southern Cal and have Notre Dame play in our stadium because those dates would probably be filled with conference ball games. So there are some pluses from the fans' viewpoint not belonging to a conference.

III. Reports of Committees.

A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

The SECRETARY reminded the Senate that at the March Senate meeting that a number of committee nominations presented by the Steering Committee were contested by additional nominations from the floor thus resulting in a ballot being circulated to the voting faculty. The SECRETARY reported on the results of this ballot and indicated that the following faculty had been elected to the following committees:

Curricula and Courses Committee
   Ina Rae Hark, Department of English
   Susie Van Huss, College of Business Administration

Faculty Advisory Committee
   William McAninch, School of Law
   William Nolte, Department of English

Faculty House Board of Governors
   John Herin, College of Business Administration
   Charles Tucker, Department of Sociology

Faculty Welfare Committee
   James Caulfield, School of Medicine
   Michael Ferri, College of Business Administration

Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee
   Patricia Mason, Department of Foreign Languages
   Alan Sear, School of Public Health
B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Patricia Mason, Chair:

The Committee's report was approved as distributed.

C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor Peter Sederberg, Chair:

Before presenting the committee's report, PROFESSOR SEDERBERG called several matters to the attention of the Senate. First of all, he reported that the Committee had developed a new form for approval of curriculum and courses, said form reflecting the fact that it is now possible to build into courses a variety of restrictions and to have these restrictions enforced through the new computer registration system. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG added that these new forms were effective immediately. Secondly, he indicated that the Committee is now insisting that all proposals be circulated for information purposes to all System campuses of the University. He explained that the Committee had received a number of complaints over the past months to the effect that after changes have been made, these are read about on the other campuses of the University in our Minutes. The other campuses very much need these course changes as soon as possible so that they can be incorporated into their own advising process. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG also informed the Senate that it is the Committee's view that the various restrictions which can be placed upon courses in the new computer registration system can now be considered curriculum matters by the Committee. Therefore, PROFESSOR SEDERBERG stated that "when the students are being excluded by policy in a course description it is a curriculum matter". He indicated that the Committee recognizes that it is necessary for departments at certain times due to the pressures on resources to establish registration priorities. The Committee also recognizes that priorities lead to de facto restrictions. Therefore, the Committee now requests that any department considering such priorities make this policy explicit and circulate this policy in advance for the Committee's information. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG then, receiving no questions, presented the Committee's report which was adopted in its entirety.

II. Reports of Officers, continued:

The CHAIR recognized PROVOST BORKOWSKI who spoke as follows:

I do have some good news regarding the budget. Let's hope that what occurred this morning is sustained over the next 45 days to 60 days, but at least the first step is a good one. The Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee this morning met and recommended unanimously to the full House Ways and Means Committee that the budget for higher education for 1983-84 be rolled back to the 1982-83 base which would be very nice. I never thought I'd find myself in the position of being happy with this year's base budget but given the possibilities for the following year that would be very good. The Subcommittee also recommended that the 4.6% cut that we undertook you recall in the fall of this year, that a portion of that cut, 2.4%, be restored and be distributed among all the higher educational institutions according to the Commission's formula. Now that would be very nice and would amount to roughly (I haven't worked out the precise dollar amounts) but it would work out to roughly 2 1/2 million over the 1982-83 base. There's a long way to go. It must now be approved by the full House Ways and Means Committee, then by the full House, and then over to the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate and to the Governor. So it's a long way to go but at least at this initial stage it is a good position from which to start and I am heartened.

We shall come to grips with the student tuition question probably before the conclusion of this academic year but not too much before. The longer in our judgment that we can delay establishing the fees the less likely that factor would be considered by the Legislature.

Tomorrow, as I am sure that you are all aware, is a major action to be undertaken by the Commission on Higher Education dealing with the Medical School. There is a proposal by Dr. Louis Wright of the Health and Medical Affairs Committee of the Commission that the two medical schools be subject to a review of a tripartite
In the course of looking at the various financial problems that we have been encumbered with this past year and with the review of the Steering Committee and with various other kinds of reviews one area that came under consideration as did virtually all areas was the Center for Undeclared Majors. The financial pressure has, of course, forced a look at many segments of the institution and one hopes that, retrospectively, a decade from now this faculty and administration and the general public will look back on these past few years as at least a time when during tight fiscal constraints reasonable steps were made without a serious deleterious effect on the quality of the institution. One hopes that that's the case. Regarding the Center for Undeclared Majors we have found the discussions that have taken place in the Provost's Office were running concurrently with discussions that were underway in Dr. Trevor Howard-Hill's Committee on Standards and Petitions. Much of the discussion in that Committee was paralleling our own thinking and at this point we are prepared to move toward phasing out of the Center for Undeclared Majors with academic advisement shifted to the appropriate colleges. I have prepared a statement to go out to the deans. I would ask that details concerning the fine points of this be delayed until the Standards and Petitions Committee has had the opportunity to conclude their work and then be directed to the chairman of that committee or certainly at a later meeting. The memo that I prepared to go out to the deans, with your indulgence, I would like to read to you:

"The Center for Undeclared Majors will be phased out over the next year with advisement shifted to the appropriate colleges. New undeclared students will choose a college which is associated with their major career interests and whose entrance requirements they meet. Starting immediately and over the period of one calendar year students currently in the Center for Undeclared Majors will be counseled into academic colleges of the University. Students eligible to continue at the University but who do not meet retention standards in their current college will continue to be advised in that college unless they present a signed change of school form showing acceptance to another college. My office will monitor this process and will be available to resolve special problems as they arise. This will not be an easy undertaking but with good will it can be accomplished with minimum inconvenience to all those concerned. Final resolution of continuing problems posed by students who are undecided and are not permitted to enter the major of choice will be reached in the light of the year's experience and further study of possible conflict between University and college regulations."
It's our considered judgment that this shift will indeed put an additional burden on the colleges. It is a burden that many faculty and many members of the administration of the colleges have stated they will be willing to undertake. We are concerned, as are the excellent staff members of the Center for Undeclared Majors, that students receive sensitive high quality advising and that this important task not be given short shrift. Over this year we hope to, as we work with the Standards and Petitions Committee, fine tune the process itself. We hope that we will have through this year and into the following year a mechanism and a model that will ensure high quality advising and through it be able to save some additional funds to apply to our budget problem.

The good news that I mentioned concerning the House Ways and Means Committee does not solve the totality of our fiscal problem as you are all aware I am sure. So we will still have to husband our resources very carefully and look at a prudent way that areas can be restructured that can diminish our costs and still maintain good quality.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, commented "as one who has taken a rather skeptical view sometimes of the Medical School particularly the expenses that have gone into it . . . ." and went on to praise the new Acting Dean of the Medical School, J. O'Neal Humphries who, according to Professor Moore, "has got a nationwide if not worldwide reputation for excellence . . . my son who is a pretty good cardiologist himself practically becomes reverential when he hears the name and says the man knows more about the heart than anybody and I think it seems to be very commendable when somebody of his stature is in this position". PROFESSOR MOORE then inquired of the Provost as to when a new revised edition of the Faculty Manual might be published. The PROVOST responded first by expressing his appreciation for Professor Moore's sentiments as "rather a novel experience". With respect to the Faculty Manual, the Provost acknowledged that a revision really is needed and that it had been his hope to have one available by January 1983. He explained that due to the press of this year's issues that his office had not been able to provide the manpower to complete this task but he assured the Senate that this remains a high priority for the weeks immediately ahead.

PROFESSOR MOORE then asked the Provost as to whether or not there have been "any or contemplated transfers of tenured professors to other departments on campus so far or do we anticipate any?" The PROVOST responded as follows:

It is possible that there may be a review with the appropriate departments of the possibility of transferring certain faculty members. I truly don't know whether that will occur. At this point given the Board action dealing with a few programs recently there may be out of that the necessity to transfer certain faculty members from one unit to another. In the College of Applied Professional Sciences that college is currently undertaking a review and is moving toward setting forward a tentative plan dealing with the alterations that have been approved by the Board. That plan I have not seen and I don't know what would be involved in terms of personnel there. Please know that we will make every effort to seek a positive accommodation of the faculty when these shifts begin to occur. But I don't know how many will be involved if indeed any at all and I won't know that until I have something more definitive in writing to review.

PROFESSOR MOORE then asked the Provost a question about transferability of credit from the State's technical institutions to the University and asked whether it was the Provost's general understanding that such institutions "are cutting back on their vocational programs but maintaining their social science and humanities programs?" The PROVOST responded as follows:

The Commission for Higher Education has been moving toward a credit transfer policy. I believe very frankly that there has been an ignorance on their part about what this could entail but they have been moving more towards precisely that. We have written to them and we have objected to it. We are presently looking at a policy that would frankly not permit that to happen. We are not talking now about courses that are college parallel courses that are offered in what in essence are seven community colleges
Discussion on Transferability of TEC Courses

in the State. These are colleges that just have college parallel courses. The Admissions Office goes through, as many of you know, a review of all of the courses of each technical college and there are booklets - one for each technical college, and approval is given to every single course at each of these colleges as to whether or not it would be acceptable or not here. Now a number of courses in the college parallel track in the seven, what are tantamount to community colleges, have been transferable. A new policy that is under consideration by the Commission would, frankly, open up the door to similar courses at all of the technical colleges and would in effect constitute a total community college system in this State. Now I am not sure that there was real understanding about what would be entailed here. This is on the agenda tomorrow. I have talked with Commission members about it. I intend to address it at the Commission on Higher Education meeting tomorrow. I do not believe that it is the intent of the Commission itself and if it is intentional it is by one or two staff members there. But we are at the present looking at a policy that would say that courses from technical colleges that are not in college parallel programs would not be accepted in the University.

PROFESSOR BRUCE MARSHALL, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, reported on this particular subject the Academic Forward Planning Committee's position as sent to the Provost some time ago and asked for the Provost's response. The Committee's recommendation was, as a general rule, that credits earned in courses that are either vocational or technical in nature, and/or part of a terminal occupational program, and/or are essentially remedial in nature, are not acceptable for transfer to the campuses of the University of South Carolina System. The Committee also recommended that individual deans be empowered to grant exceptions to that rule and in occasional cases where there are very special needs that a student can present to establish a clear relationship between the work taken at a technical school and a particular program of study at the University. The PROVOST responded that he was going to press exactly this issue on the Commission. PROFESSOR MOORE asked again whether or not his understanding was correct "that some technical schools are in fact both cutting back on the technical and vocational programs but maintaining the college parallel courses?" PROVOST BORKOWSKI responded that he really did not know the answer to that question but conjectured that at certain of the technical colleges, for example, Greenville Technical College, that could very well be the case.

PROFESSOR DONALD WEATHERBEE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, asked the Provost whether or not there were any budgetary implications for the University inherent in whatever action the Commission may take with respect to the two medical schools. For example, if USC Medical School were to become a two year campus, would this "lead to a freeing up of some resources that are now tied up in the Medical School"? The PROVOST responded as follows:

In our judgment there would be no freeing up of funds at all were this action to take place. The notion that there would be a savings out of a merger of $5 million is based on spurious assumptions. We have looked at it carefully. It is possible that such a merger could indeed be more costly than having two separate institutions. It is difficult, I don't mind telling you extremely difficult, to come out with a really fair comparison of the two institutions because we simply count costs differently. It is not that MUSC's is wrong or ours is wrong on one is right or the other - it's just that they do not put into their figures certain costs that we do. For example, the Medical University does not count library; does not count capital improvement on maintenance; does not count the graduate education program; and does not count the salaries of the chief administrators into their cost per student. The USC Medical School does. So it's hard to come up with comparable figures. But on the basis of the best estimates that we have it is our judgment it is very unlikely that there would be any savings whatsoever in the proposed merger and the method by which that $5 million was calculated is simply a very poor method. We have refuted that and sent a number of documents to point that out. The cost to students in our judgment would rise. The students would take basic science programs
in Charleston and then have to move to Columbia. There are additional costs I think that haven't at all been considered here for the student and for the institutions. We do not see any financial gain by the proposed action.

PROFESSOR WARD BRIGGS, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES, raised a question regarding the "possible dissolution of the Center for Undeclared Majors" and inquired as to whether or not the Provost had "any projections on the impact this will have on the various colleges?" He also asked whether or not "these students will be distributed roughly proportionately to the number of majors in various colleges now or will some colleges be more impacted than others?" The PROVOST commented that this was very difficult to project and that it was possible that certain colleges, for example, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, may feel a greater impact than others. He elaborated that as the students are assigned to colleges under consideration, such as in Humanities and Social Sciences, the so-called Dean's Advisors would deal with these students. The PROVOST concluded that he was uncertain as to how all this would work out but that this will be evaluated as the year progresses.

The CHAIR called this time for the resumption of the normal order of business according to the Senate agenda.

III. Reports of Committees (continued).

D. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Robert Felix, Chair:

PROFESSOR FELIX made reference to the report of his committee, pages A-8 - A-10, and made brief additional comments and elaboration on the last sentence of the report on page 10. He explained that among matters on the agenda of the committee are "the possibly desirable inclusion of specific references to programs in the Faculty Manual"; "the possibility of amending the provisions for reduction in force of tenured faculty"; and "the nature of the degree of faculty consultation in comparable situations should they occur in the future". PROFESSOR FELIX concluded by echoing previously expressed sentiments of Professor Moore for the need of a revised Faculty Manual.

PROFESSOR CHARLES McNEILL, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, made the following response to this report:

As the representative of the College of Education that initiated this study, I would like to respond if I may very briefly. I would respond as an individual since I haven't been instructed. I just wanted to congratulate the Committee for a job well done. It's a lot of time and effort they put into it and I feel that they did a thorough job. I would like to reecho their conclusions. I do trust that this report will give members of faculty and particularly the Senate cause for study and reflection.

E. Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee, Professor Trevor Howard-Hill, Chair:

PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL opened by making an apology to Student Government Association President Ashley Abel for "some adverse statement" made at the March Senate meeting. Then PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL presented to the Senate his committee's report on page A-11 with the following editorial corrections: page A-11, A, (3), line 4, "1982 meeting" should read "1983 meeting" and (g), line 2, "from consistent" should read "form consistent" and line 6, "form a GPD" to "from a GPD". The Senate approved section A. Then PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL informed the Senate that "there are matters of academic principle here that do deserve some discussion and endorsement by faculty . . . . " and such a discussion ensued.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM RAWSON, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, spoke with reference to the Committee's statement that "admission requirements are not explicit in the Bulletin and inquired of Professor Howard-Hill as to how requirements could be stated more clearly? PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL responded that the statement referred to the fact that there are not explicit statements of projected GPR requirements. PROFESSOR COLIN BENNETT then asked whether or not the students would be "assigned rather than have the colleges select them" and PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL responded "this is an administrative matter - the ball will be in the hands of the Provost . . . . "

M-8
PROFESSOR ROGER SULLIVAN, DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, spoke to the Senate for the purpose of making "some statement of appreciation to the Center for Undeclared Majors", as follows:

People there have dedicated themselves to the students who are not exceptional often, are confused about their vocational goals, who need time, who very often because they don't have a definite focus their GPR's are not outstanding. I think of the history of how advising was done for these people before we had the Center for Undeclared Majors. At one time faculty were indiscriminately assigned to these students. Many of the faculty no matter how dedicated they were, didn't know the provisions of the catalogue. Students were badly advised. Many of them had to go to school another year because they were badly advised through no fault of their own. By contrast the Center for Undeclared Majors includes people who are experts, who know as much about the catalogue as anybody at the University. At one time because faculty complained of the load faculty wives were given the job of advising. I am not sure how large the budget is for the Center for Undeclared Majors but the Center's students are at least a significant proportion of our students; I believe they are the largest school in the University some 3,000. It may really well be the case that it would be better taken care of and their interests will be served. Or to the contrary, the ratio of students who will begin to flunk out and simply disappear will begin to rise as it was in the past when we had other alternatives.

PROFESSOR ROBERT PHILP, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, responded to Professor Sullivan by adding "I would say that if you walked in the Center for Undeclared Majors now - wait until the end of the summer and then you will really appreciate what they have done". PROFESSOR PHILP then asked whether or not the number of students had been calculated who will meet admission requirements to the University but who will not meet admission requirements of colleges other than Science and Mathematics and Humanities and Social Sciences? PROFESSOR DONALD WEATHERBEE, DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, spoke to make reference to the statement by the Committee chairman that there "was a question of academic principle here" and asked "what principle was involved?" PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL responded:

The principle addressed by my Committee is that the students come to the University to pursue a course of study and the best place of student course of study is in the body of faculty devoted to teaching that course of study. I indeed recognize the benefits that Undeclared Majors have received from their advisors but I firmly believe and so does every member of my committee that a college is the best place to advise people who wish to receive the benefits of education provided by that college and nothing can take that away. Nothing can substitute for the close attention which an individual faculty member could give to the students under his charge. Therefore, we recommend that a student is obliged to meet that and concentrate his mind so that he receives this attention. I think there will be fewer people in an undecided category even within these colleges once they get in and talk with the faculty and meet them and know that faculty have some concern for them. I think this is a matter of principle. Now if individual faculty do not advise their students I don't think putting students into a general floating category to let them wonder around is ultimately to the good of this University.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, indicated that he was "basically in agreement" with the remarks of Professor Howard-Hill and added that he also believed that Professor Sullivan's "admonitions" were "very very well taken .... I think he and I can remember very well when there was a very profound need for this kind of a Center - that is why it was created and the fact that they have so many students probably is an indication that this need continues".
MR. ASHLEY ABEL, STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT, requested and obtained the permission of the Senate to address the body. MR. ABEL spoke in his capacity as someone who came into the Honors Program as an Undeclared Major, as follows:

It is not only the people who have no direction that go into the program but also the people who have a lot of varied interests. I think it would have been difficult for someone like myself to have been advised by someone in Business - my interests were in Business and Engineering. To have been advised by someone in the Business School who would be telling me which courses in Engineering would be the best ones for me to take and see if I enjoy Engineering or if I indeed enjoyed Business more and I think that is a question that we need to consider because there is a question in a lot of people's minds that go into the Center for Undeclared Majors. Thank you.

PROFESSOR DONALD WEATHERBEE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, informed the Senate that he was disturbed by this discussion and pointed out that the Provost had placed the recommendation for the phasing out of the Center "in the framework of budgetary cuts" but that now Professor Weatherbee was hearing "the entire question placed in front of us on academic principles". PROFESSOR WEATHERBEE concluded that it was confusing as to what the real issue is, but that if it was a matter of academics "I think that the comments that have been made with respect to the function of the Center are very very relevant". PROFESSOR WEATHERBEE went on to say:

Let's not live in the ivory tower. Most of us know that previous to the Center's existence there was what can be called a revolving door advisor which is very poor advising. Now, obviously, if we had a small college with a small number of students who have the proper motivation and who perhaps did not need remediation, who could have a one-on-one relationship as a first year or second year student with an assigned faculty member, then distributing them to the "colleges" would be the ideal solution. But this institution is so large that the number of students who are, I don't want to use the word problem students, but students who really do not know what way they wish to follow is so great that to dismantle the Center on the basis of somehow or other there is an intellectual justification, I think I would not support the resolution. However, if the answer to the question is that this is one of the areas that must be sacrificed in order to preserve our financial posture that is a different question altogether and I am confused.

The CHAIR called for the question and the recommendation that "all students must enter a college of the University" was defeated, 47 opposed, 27 for.

PROFESSOR TREVOR HOWARD-HILL responded that he would let the Provost consider this matter further. PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL went on to present recommendation IV, page A-12, that "students must declare a major after 30 credit hours of course work". PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL explained this was a recommendation which had come originally from the Academic Forward Planning Committee and that it could be considered by the Senate for application to students whether the students were assigned to the Center for Undeclared Majors or collegiate units. PROFESSOR JERRY CURRY, DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC, pointed out that one of "their serious downfalls" (referring to the discussion of the Center for Undeclared Majors) was the "lack of effort toward getting rid of the students they are advising". PROFESSOR CURRY informed the Senate that his college petitions committee this year has heard several petitions of students who are in their last 30 hours and who wish to graduate but who have not yet declared a major. Therefore, he spoke in support of this recommendation.

DR. THORNE COMPTON, ASSOCIATE DEAN, COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, pointed out to the Senate his confusion based upon the Senate action rejecting the recommendation that all students must enter a college of the University while simultaneously there is no longer a Center for Undeclared Majors. DR. COMPTON requested a clarification from the Chair as to what the impact of this Senate action would be on the decision to do away with the administrative unit. The CHAIR called upon the PROVOST who responded as follows:
I think at this point we will simply take under very serious consideration the action of the Senate and look at the financial issues which remain. I simply don't know at this point. But we still have remaining serious fiscal problems which was the stimulus for moving on this. My remarks have been parallel with the discussions in Standards and Petitions Committee about how we have evaluated this.

PROFESSOR DONALD WEATHERBEE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, responded that it was his interpretation that the Faculty Senate action "did not endorse this administrative move on the basis of it being a good academic move" and reminded the Senate that budgetary decisions should not be confused with programmatic decisions based on academic considerations. PROFESSOR BRUCE MARSHALL, CHAIRMAN, ACADEMIC FORWARD PLANNING COMMITTEE, spoke with reference to the second recommendation of the report that students must declare a major after 30 credit hours of course work. PROFESSOR MARSHALL informed the Senate that the Committee concluded that it was essential that this recommendation be enacted and that the figure of 30 hours "seemed perfectly appropriate". PROFESSOR MARSHALL also indicated that this was a separate matter from "the question of how advisement was to be conducted during that first 30 hours". He indicated that during the Committee's discussion of this recommendation it was their assumption "that the Center for Undeclared Majors would continue to perform the functions of an advising body during the first 30 hours". PROFESSOR MARSHALL concurred with Professor Weatherbee's observation that this "is a separate question" which "may depend upon the resources being available to support that operation". PROFESSOR MARSHALL concluded that if the resources are not available then the responsibility for advising would presumably rest with the various colleges. It was also his opinion that recommendation 1 was not absolutely essential but that item 2 was. PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, spoke to remind the Chair, the Senate, and the Provost "that actions of the Senate can be reviewed in the General Faculty meeting in the spring".

PROFESSOR WILLIAM MCANINCH, SCHOOL OF LAW, inquired as to the rationale for requiring that students must declare a major after two semesters. PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL responded that this was to avoid "getting into the situation that Dr. Curry mentioned where people just drifted around taking bunches of courses because they were either interested in everything or interested in nothing". PROFESSOR TED SIMPSON, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, informed the Senate that he was "shocked" that the body was not willing to consider the matter of limited resources and that he was "shocked to hear that it is not an academic concern for us to decide how we budget our time, our effort, and the monies provided to us by the taxpayers of this state to accomplish a result". PROFESSOR EUGENE LONG, DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, spoke in support of Professor McAninch's question and indicated that the recommendation requiring students to declare a major after 30 hours of course work "is too short a period in which to press the student to make some clear cut decision". PROFESSOR LONG concluded that the consequence of approving this recommendation could be interpreted as professionalizing liberal education at the undergraduate level". PROFESSOR PATRICK SCOTT, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, spoke in support of the recommendation and concluded that "It simply seems to me to be a model of good advisement to get people started on the right track at the end of their first year and it certainly doesn't shut people out from a liberal education".

PROFESSOR WARD BRIGGS, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES, raised a point of information and inquired as to whether or not the recommendation requiring students to declare a major after 30 credit hours "means after the completion of 30 credit work which would mean before their next advisement in the fall of the sophomore year for the average student?" PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL indicated that he would accept that interpretation. PROFESSOR ED MERCER, ASSISTANT DEAN, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS, stated that in his opinion that interpretation would be impractical. In his opinion "it would seem to me that this would occur in most students prior to advisement in the fall of the sophomore year...I think it would be impractical and unrealistic to say you declare it during spring of your freshman year". PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL concurred with Professor Mercer.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, spoke in support of Professor Long's statements and inquired of Professor Marshall as to whether or not the Academic Forward Planning Committee had considered the impact of this recommendation on the fabric of a liberal arts education. PROFESSOR MARSHALL responded that the Committee had considered this matter and that what it wanted was "a single rule that applies to all colleges of the University and it just happens to be the case that in many colleges there are more highly structured programs than Humanities and Social Sciences and unless you begin in the sophomore year and in some instances the freshman year you are going to have to do additional work and you will not be able to complete the program in four years".
PROFESSOR MARSHALL concurred with the statement previously made by Professor Scott that "this is simply a demand that students think seriously about where they are going and make the initial designation of the major which gets them then under the advisement of a particular college or department."

PROFESSOR COLIN BENNETT, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, raised a question about the reference to a "current 'common' curriculum" for the freshman year made in recommendation IV, 2, page A-12, and inquired as to whether or not that report was public. PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL responded that that report had not been made public. PROFESSOR MARSHALL indicated that his committee had not made a detailed proposal for a common curriculum for the freshman year and had instead only presented an outline of such a curriculum as it might bear on the recommendation being considered here to require students to declare a major after 30 hours of course work. PROFESSOR BENNETT responded that he had voted against the first recommendation because he was confused as to how many students were involved in such a recommendation and what the impact of that recommendation would be on his college. He added that he was going to vote against the second recommendation because so little information had been provided about this common curriculum that he could not determine whether or not "this indeed was a viable program for students".

PROFESSOR JERRY CURRY, DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC, inquired as to whether or not this recommendation literally meant that a student could not declare a major before 30 hours. PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL responded to this question at the request of the Chair. He said that the recommendation "was made in reference to Undeclared Majors and it is that they must declare a major after 30 credit hours and as Professor Mercer said that is before they start their sophomore year".

DR. THORNE COMPTON, ASSOCIATE DEAN, COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, spoke to enter the following sentiments into the record:

I have one comment about the general principle involved in this point. Specifically this issue has been discussed well throughout most of this year with several committees on which I sat with students and Assistant Associate Deans and the Academic Forward Planning Committee. We have kicked around most of the issues that have been discussed here. Back a few months ago there was discussion about this proposal and we sat down to figure out how many students would be involved, what colleges they would go to, and when they would proceed to those colleges. We started making plans as to how we would respond to them. I think it is accepted by many people who looked at the issue that the College of Humanities and Social Sciences will initially have to advise a lot of these students. We are prepared to do that. We have now an extremely good freshman and sophomore advisement system and I think it is as good as anything that has been on this campus. It is done by faculty members who worked with us in the summer and in the fall and spring designated by the Dean's office and they handle these students. We are not concerned about all of those students coming in because I think we can handle that and we can handle it well. As to moving at the end of 30 hours, one of the things that has caused Jim Lancaster enormous problems in the Center for Undeclared Majors is that in the last five years the requirements of the colleges on campus have gone off in a lot of different directions as have the progression standards so that it has become increasingly difficult for a student to enter the Center for Undeclared Majors and then a year later or two years later move into the College of Engineering and not have lost anything. That is essentially impossible. It has become increasingly apparent on this campus that requirements have forced students to make a decision early and when they haven't then they may waste the next three years. That's not true in my college and it's not true in Ed Mercer's college but it is true in most of the professional schools and I think the deans of those colleges will be happy to tell you that. So this is an issue that has been made over and over again for which there has been a tremendous amount of concern shown by a lot of people. I just wanted to get that into the record.
The CHAIR called for the question and the Senate approved the recommendation that "students must declare a major after 30 credit hours of course work".

PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL then moved the following recommendation:

"Courses which are usually open to students with 30 or fewer credit hours (freshmen) must be open to all students who meet prerequisites. Prerequisites must be published in the bulletin. Exceptions must be approved by the Senate."

There was no discussion of this motion and it was approved by the Senate.

PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL then directed the Senate's attention to item V, page A-13 and invited the Senators to "re-examine your stand on the Center for Undeclared Majors". He explained that this recommendation being considered had been drafted by the Provost's Office and had the endorsement of his committee. Specifically the recommendation under consideration was as follows:

Any entering or continuing student who is academically ineligible to enter or to continue in the college of choice, but who meets the admission and retention standards of the University, will be registered in a college whose entrance standards permit and which is appropriate to the student's academic and professional interests. A student will be registered in this condition, i.e., without a stated major, for no more than a total of 30 semester hours. After earning that number of credit hours as a non-major, with the exception of summer sessions, the students will not be permitted to register at the University of South Carolina-Columbia, except as an accepted major in a degree program.

PROFESSOR TREVOR HOWARD-HILL explained the committee's rationale as follows:

Our concern was with what happens to this vast number of students - 26% of the students on this campus. No one has yet here persuaded me that in some undefined way they are better off being advised in an administrative unit rather than being in the company of their peers with whom they share some vague kind of vocational interest; where they can be put into programs; where they can satisfy progression requirements; where they can be advised at any point within an established academic context. We have a remarkable position now where we have people in the University, students whom we value, who have technically no homes but a bureaucratic organization which is established merely for the point of giving them something to call their home. I think that the college is the best place and nothing I have heard here persuades me otherwise.

The CHAIR requested Professor Howard-Hill to comment whether or not the intent of this motion would conflict with the will of the Senate, "whether the Center for Undeclared Majors in terms of academic policy should continue and to put it on a more practical basis will your motion make it impossible for an entering student to be placed in the Center for Undeclared Majors ... if so, I would rule it out of order". PROFESSORS HOWARD-HILL responded that the intention of this recommendation was to "acknowledge the administrative actions made and announced by the Provost". PROFESSOR PATRICK SCOTT, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, stated that it would be his interpretation that this motion does not conflict with the Senate's previous action. However, PROFESSOR ROGER SULLIVAN, DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, concluded that this motion was in direct conflict with the Senate's rejection of the first motion. Additional interpretations were offered by PROFESSORS MARSHALL and WEASHER OF GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, and PROFESSOR PATRICK SCOTT, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH. The CHAIR then requested comments from Dr. James Lancaster, the Director of the University Center for Undeclared Majors. DR. LANCASTER responded as follows:

Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to trying to readvise a student who has been ineligible to continue in one academic program who is now looking for a new home. Unfortunately we were given that task some time ago (when the admissions, progression and retention standards began to differ) as the
people best situated to do that, and that has caused us the problems. The really undecided freshmen have never been a problem to this program. We were set up to deal with them. The ineligibles are the problem. If it is the will of the Senate I have no objection to setting a time limit for these people to be under our guidance while they make a reasonable decision about a new major. In fact I would welcome such a limit. Whether this motion, the way this is phrased, really deals with problems adequately I doubt it seriously.

As a result of this discussion, the CHAIR ruled that this motion was out of order.

E. Academic Forward Planning Committee, Professor D. Bruce Marshall, Chair:

PROFESSOR BRUCE MARSHALL made the following report to the Senate:

The Academic Forward Planning Committee is, strictly speaking, an administrative committee which exists to advise the President and the Provost. The President and the Provost are ex officio members of the committee and we do have the benefit not only of members from this campus who are appointed by the Steering Committee but also have representatives to the Two-Year Senate and from the other Four-Year campuses of our System. So it is a System-wide advisory committee which doesn't normally report to the Senate. Most of our reports go directly to the President and the Provost.

We have in the last month had some very, very, useful and extended discussions, notably with the Dean of the College of Education concerning the revisions in the curriculum of the College of Education. Since that matter has been on the minds of many senators in the last several months I would like to take advantage of just this opportunity to tell you that we will be receiving in the near future some proposals which will go to the Curriculum Committee to spell out the changes that have been developed within that college. Our committee met for the better part of three hours with the Dean and reviewed the general line of argument that those developments will take. The Committee, first of all, wanted to very strongly support the general logic of the argument that the Dean is developing and to compliment both the Dean and the faculty of that college who have worked very hard to put together a revised program that will make it possible to complete a discipline and a well structured major in a subject matter discipline in a period of approximately 138 undergraduate hours to also receive a teaching certificate. Although there has been a lot of discussion about a five year program, there will be a series of course changes proposed to you that will make it possible for students who are interested in a profession in education who do not want to pursue the master's level route initially, but who can nevertheless complete their teaching certificate by doing some additional work that is incorporated in the undergraduate program. Now we found that a very, very, fruitful approach which merits your careful and we think supportive concern when that is brought forward to you.

We have also been doing other things. In the course of the year you have heard about a few of them. Today I will simply mention one more for your information that concerns the development of a program to reinforce the teaching of foreign languages in the University, and that's a subject that is sensitive to the ears of many in the Senate. We have had extended debates on it in the past. Let me assure you that some proposals that have been made, the essence of which is the substance of demonstrated proficiency in language for the accumulation of course hours, are being worked on to come up with a reasonable way of achieving that measure of proficiency. The
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Foreign Language Department is also experimenting with some new approaches which seem extremely interesting and worthy of support. The proposals that will be forthcoming will go to the faculties of the individual colleges concerned. Since they do not concern the University requirements as a whole they will not come before the Senate. But they will go to the Colleges of Humanities and Social Sciences and Science and Mathematics once they have been refined a little bit further. Thank you very much.

The CHAIR called for reports from other committees and recognized Professor Richard Conant, Chairman of the Faculty House Board of Governors. PROFESSOR CONANT called the attention of the Senate to an open membership meeting to be held on May 3rd at 4:30 p.m. in Currell College. There will be refreshments and dinner following this meeting at Faculty House and all Senators were welcomed.

V. Report of the Secretary.

No report.

VI. Unfinished Business.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, reminded the Senate of his request to Professor Howard-Hill at the March Senate meeting that the Committee reevaluate the current attendance policy. In the context of, as Professor Moore put it, "approaching these things very carefully like porcupines making love", PROFESSOR MOORE reminded Professor Howard-Hill that the point of his inquiry was to urge the committee to assess the attendance policy based on the experience of the fall 1982 semester even though the spring 1983 semester, admittedly, has not been completed. The CHAIR interjected that indeed some response has been called for to this question and a report at the May meeting.

VII. Good of the Order.

The CHAIR recognized PRESIDENT HOLDERMAN who spoke to the Senate as follows:

I apologize ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, for being tardy today but I understand I was ably represented in a switch by the Coach. The Provost tells me that he has already reviewed with you the movement of the House Ways and Means Committee. That is, as I am sure he pointed out to you, a very early stage movement. It has the whole House and the Senate Finance and the whole Senate to go through before it is adopted. But it is encouraging to us and I want to assure you that, as I am sure the Provost did, the entire University family is working together to accomplish these objectives to lighten the fiscal problems that afflict us. He also, I am sure, mentioned to you the Medical School situation. Hopefully that will be resolved tomorrow, probably not once and for all. (That's too much to hope for). We are optimistic that the merger question will be put to rest at least for the foreseeable future. And for the record (or the State in this case) we have been very pleased with the five part series which has been covering the Medical School question. I realize that the fifth part is coming out tomorrow and I may request the right to revise and extend my remarks after reading it. But we are confident that things are moving along fairly favorably for us in a variety of directions. Really, Mr. Chairman I came in late and I so seldom get to say anything for the Good of the Order that I thought I would take a chance on that and if there are any questions if you would allow them - I hate to cause Ray Moore withdrawal symptoms but if there are any questions I would be happy to answer them.

PROFESSOR MOORE indicated that he had no questions for the President "today" and the President duly thanked him. PROFESSOR MOORE added that "I am changing my strategy".
VIII. Announcements.

PROFESSOR BARBARA TENENBAUM, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, announced in her capacity as the Campus Representative for the Institute of International Education, formerly known as the Fulbright Program, that one of our graduate students has won a Fulbright grant for academic year 1983-84. This student is Lisa Lader, a first year graduate in the German Department. PROFESSOR TENENBAUM concluded that "we feel a great deal of pride in Lisa's accomplishment". PROFESSOR TENENBAUM also commended Katherine Mille of the Admissions Office and the entire Department of German for "the outstanding work they have done in helping Lisa win her year at the University of Bamberg". There were no additional announcements.

The Senate was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.