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

I. Correction of the Minutes.

The SECRETARY reported that Professor Robert Janiskee of the Department of Geography had requested the record reflect that he was present at the November meeting. The minutes were approved as distributed.

II. Reports of University Officers.

The CHAIRMAN reported to the Senate on the formation of a special nine member committee of the faculty for the purpose of reviewing with the President discontinuation or reductions of academic programs or instructional units. He reported that this committee was provided for in the report adopted by the Faculty Senate on October 1, 1980 and subsequently revised on April 15, 1981, that report dealing with a mechanism for the possible termination of tenured faculty in the event of bona fide reduction in staff. The CHAIR informed the Senate that as stipulated in the policy faculty members were appointed, with no more than two drawn from the same college, and all were appointed with the concurrence of the Faculty Advisory Committee on November 8. PROFESSOR PATTERSON explained that as a result of the completion of the fiscal review process, about which the Senate has been informed previously and because fiscal plans were being considered which included the possibility of bona fide reductions in tenured faculty, consequently it was necessary to constitute the special nine person committee. The nine faculty appointed were as follows:

- James Caulfield - School of Medicine
- John Dean - College of Science and Mathematics
- Robert Felix - School of Law
- John Gardner - College of Applied Professional Sciences
- Donald Greiner - College of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Garrett Mandeville - College of Education
- Bruce Marshall - College of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Olin Pugh - College of Business Administration
- Harriet Williams - College of Health

The CHAIR reported that this nine person committee had met on November the 18th with the President and had discharged its initially assigned function. Because the policies reviewed by that committee are the ultimate responsibility of the Board of Trustees, the Chair recognized President Holderman for further discussion of this matter.

The PRESIDENT addressed the Senate as follows:

Let me review with you in fairly general terms where we are with respect to the budget situation and let me first of all applaud the tremendous cooperation the Provost and I and others have received from the faculty committees. They have been extraordinary in their usefulness and way beyond the call of duty in their willingness to work and review things in total perspective and thereby participate in the development of some recommendations which a week from Friday we will present to the Board of Trustees for their consideration and adoption in principle. We then will move to implement those activities.
Most of you are aware that the Columbia campus faces in the fall of 1983-84 a potential shortfall of 10.7 million dollars. We face as a System a potential shortfall of 13.5 million dollars. That is a projected needs analysis based on what we know we are going to have to spend to meet the commitment on salaries, on annualizing this momentous 2% raise that you're getting on the first of January, the cost of utilities and other activities, general cost of living and inflation expenses which the University confronts and, as I said, Columbia comes out with about a 10.7 million dollar shortfall - the System with about 13.5. We, thanks to the cooperation already noted of the faculty, have put together a package which the Provost and others are now reviewing with the affected units of the University. We are talking on the Columbia campus of approximately 2 million dollars, about 55% of which is in the straight instructional area and 45% is in support services area which is about the same proportion with a little edge to the academic for the total University budget. About 1.1 million of it will come out of academic affairs and another 900,000 out of other support services.

After considerable deliberation and attention we have determined it will not now be necessary to phase out or eliminate positions of tenured faculty. We will not at this time make any negative recommendations with respect to tenured faculty. That is something that I think all of us have agreed that we would like to see put off until the very, very end of any budgetary crisis. Hopefully the economy will begin to turn. We all have been thinking that for sometime and some of us have even been saying it. But we need to have a turn for us to make the kind of budgetary comeback that is a prerequisite to our continued success. I cannot be terribly explicit today because some of the units affected haven't yet been fully contacted and I would prefer not to surprise anybody by a public announcement here. I do want to say this to you. The Board of Trustees is prepared on a week from Friday to hear anyone who wants to come and make a case about the particular recommendations that may be forthcoming. We talked with members of the Board and they are willing to waive the 10 day notice period for permission to speak to the Board and I am very anxious to assure the faculty and other administrators that they will have access to the Board should they want it before any decisions are made. I think that is extremely important.

Instruction, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support and operation and maintenance, are all touched by this program for Columbia. We will eliminate two vice presidencies - two people are retiring; we will not advertise or fill their positions. We will consolidate their administrative responsibilities with other administrators of the University. We will do things like eliminate the taxi service, eliminate the Alumni Quarterly, cut down on numbers of catalogs we publish because we generally end up with a lot that are unused. Those reflect some of the non-academic specific considerations and there will be changes in some academic areas. Approximately 90 slots, almost evenly divided between classified and unclassified, will be touched, but, as I said, no tenured faculty, and we intend, barring catastrophic unforeseen circumstances, to retain that posture.

The potential of a 3 million dollar programmatic reduction at the Columbia or a 2 million dollar programmatic reduction at the Columbia campus and a little more than 3 for the entire System, leaves us with still on the Columbia campus an 8 million dollar problem. Certainly
I don't think there is any way unless some miracle happens that we can avoid a fairly substantial tuition increase. I do not believe that we will recommend a tuition increase which would absorb the entire 8 million dollar balance on this campus. That would take $400 a year in state tuition. I do not believe that we will recommend that.

I think more appropriately that we will take an upfront position that the problems of the University with respect to its budget are also the problems of the State of South Carolina and this is not a dimension which this University can solve by itself and we need to directly say that to state agency leadership and the Legislature. I do not believe that the ballgame is anywhere near being over and I do believe that the University has a substantial case in a positive form to make to members of the General Assembly. You may or may not know that the Commission on Higher Education at its last meeting did adopt, or was instructed by the Budget and Control Board at its last meeting to reconsider the distribution of dollars within a pattern of high technology responses. That is what the University is doing and planning to do in the area of programs which will help attract business and investment to South Carolina. We are very pleased to have that stance taken because in the resolution itself they directed the Commission on Higher Education not to stand by its preliminary or previous recommendations as the gospel. I think that back has been essentially broken and we need to move on from there. But I can assure you that we will leave no stone unturned in making the University case for as much more funding as we possibly can to accommodate the needs of the institution on all of its campuses.

I should tell you something else that is happening simultaneously. A staff report from the Commission on Higher Education has now recommended and they have under consideration, although I do not think it is going to go anywhere, a plan that would take the five two-year campuses of the University System and distribute them or phase them out. The plan of the staff of the Commission is to close Salkehatchie and Union and to take Sumter, Lancaster, and Beaufort and merge them with the local TEC schools. I think that that proposal will die of its own weight, hopefully soon. It will be something that the University will certainly spend a great deal of its attention on. I told a member of the Commission who seems to be responsible for this kind of activity that if he wanted the University's attention this was certainly one way to get it. It has it at this point in time.

We are prepared to answer any particular questions that some of you might have or any of you might have about the budget. I would prefer as I said not to go into specific detail because some of the units to be affected have not yet been fully notified although the leadership in those units does know what is taking place.

SENATOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, spoke to commend the President and the administration "for the sensitivity on the problem of the tenured personnel." SENATOR MOORE added that any move to eliminate tenured faculty members should only be "absolutely the last gasp" and expressed his reinforcement of the President for thinking in that same fashion. SENATOR MOORE also commended the President for the "broad interpretation that you have given to the meaning of high tech education" as being construed in a broad sense based on the liberal arts. Finally, SENATOR MOORE in reference to the athletic situation at Clemson University asked the President whether any of the lessons learned at Clemson were "transferable lessons for us down here?"
PRESIDENT HOLDERMAN responded that Clemson President Atchley's comment "that he would be glad to help other institutions clean up their own house was qratitutous". SENATOR MOORE then asked the President whether or not he thought "our situation is in good enough shape that we may avoid a similar situation?" The PRESIDENT responded that "if anybody thinks that our football team is dishonest - we don't cheat!" and added that he did not wish to comment on any of the specific NCAA or ACC actions with respect to Clemson other than to "wish them well in straightening out what appears to be an extraordinarily serious problem". SENATOR MOORE rephrased his previous question as follows: "Do you feel that our situation is well in hand there so that the chances of anything like this happening here are very low... are you taking any more positive action as a University President in the oversight of the operation... ?" To this the PRESIDENT responded as follows:

I think that with Bob Marcum as Director of Athletics we have a man who is first and foremost an ethical Athletic Director who is running a very tight ship and I do not get involved anymore, thankfully, in the activities of the Athletic Department and it is a very pleasant experience. I want to tell you that I found out yesterday from reading a letter of recommendation on a candidate for a scholarship for which I am involved in the selection, from the President of Harvard about a young man who had played basketball at Harvard. The President of Harvard spent a lot of time talking about how he had convinced the boy to go back to the basketball team. So even Derek Bok gets involved with athletics. That gave me a sense of relief and empathy. But I really believe our Athletic Department is a good, clean, honest operation. I think we have some very honorable people involved in it.

PROFESSOR GLENN ABERNATHY, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, inquired of the President whether or not there was to be any notification prior to the Board meeting about the specifics of the proposed cuts. The PRESIDENT responded that "this thing will probably be public by the weekend or the first of next week" and that the mailing of this information to the Board was going out the following day, December the 2nd. The PRESIDENT added the University would distribute this information "as widely as we can in advance of the meeting on Friday" and added that "we want no concern that this is going to be a steamroller job without any attention to interested parties".

There were no other reports from University Officers.

III. Reports of Committees.

A. Grade Change Committee, Professor Patricia Mason, Chair:

PROFESSOR MASON noted that the report before the Senate included the proposed grade change for Suzi Collins which had been withdrawn at the November Senate meeting and is now presented in corrected form as a requested grade change for fall 1981. The report was approved as submitted.

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

The Senate first approved the proposals for Roman I, College of Humanities and Social Sciences. With respect to Roman II, a proposal for changing curriculum in the College of Journalism, PROFESSOR SEDERBERG called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the document before them, on page A-3, inadvertently omitted the total hours for the News-Editorial sequence as being 15, and the total hours required for the degree, 120. This section and following Roman III, College of Nursing changes, were approved.

The Senate then engaged in lengthy debate over the following committee recommendation:

IV. Proposed change in the regulations governing independent study (see p. U14).

The purpose of the independent study option is to allow the student to pursue an area of academic interest not adequately covered by the regular course structure. The experience shall involve an academic product that is consistent with the student's program of study.
Prior to enrolling in an undergraduate independent study course, a student must complete an Independent Study or Internship Contract (AS-5). The approval of the instructor, adviser, and the department chair is required; students then present their approved copy when registering for the course. Only students majoring or minoring in the relevant discipline may receive grade-point credit for independent study. All other students will receive pass-fail credit.

No more than fifteen credits of independent study may be applied toward any undergraduate degree.

First, PROFESSOR SEDERBERG made what he called a "clarification with legislative intent" which he wished to be incorporated into the Minutes. He explained that a question had been raised about the Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies degree where a student might develop an independent study project accepted by his adviser as part of his BAIS program. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG explained that this would be considered as the committee's intent to be construed to be part of the student's major program and thus could receive grade point credit. A second clarification was with respect to South Carolina College students taking an SCCS independent study accepted by the major adviser for major credit. In that case it would be considered a major course and would thus receive grade point credit. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG also explained that the purpose behind this proposed change as follows:

The purpose behind this change is in response to a number of problems which came to our attention to clarify the intent of independent study. That intent is clarified by this first paragraph which we have added to the current statement... the solution that we came up with is not entirely perfect but we feel it will prevent most of the abuses that have come to our attention and will preserve the academic integrity of the independent study.

PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM, inquired as to whether the "chair" referenced in the second paragraph of the motion is the student's "chair"? PROFESSOR SEDERBERG responded in the negative and stated that it is "the department chair". PROFESSOR PRICE inquired "well, what department are you talking about?" PROFESSOR SEDERBERG indicated that the department "would be a major or minor." In response to further questioning by Professor Price, PROFESSOR SEDERBERG added it is the department that is offering the independent study. PROFESSOR PRICE then inquired whether or not the committee had considered cognates to be inherent in the proposed wording "only students majoring or minoring"? PROFESSOR SEDERBERG responded that the committee had considered cognates and "it was the guarded opinion of the committee that the cognate is sufficiently unstructured as to be open to almost as much abuse in many departments as the elective".

PROFESSOR MERCER spoke in support of the intent of this regulation and expressed serious concern as to whether the committee had investigated how such a proposed regulation can be enforced, particularly with respect to minors. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG responded that the first step in enforcement is simply to have a regulation that at least in theory is enforceable. He explained that the problem with the formal regulation was that the 399 independent study was "wide open" and that "indeed it was completely unenforceable". PROFESSOR MERCER pointed out that the grade points are calculated by semester and not only the semester before the student graduates. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG indicated that the committee had not asked the University Registrar if it would be possible to go back and recalculate grade point ratio on a semester by semester basis and enforce the proposed regulation. THORNE COMPTON, ASSOCIATE DEAN of the COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, informed the Senate that his college now generated a list for all students who are minoring in particular fields. PROFESSOR ROBERT JANISKEE, GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENT, raised a question about the possible ambiguity of the proposed motion and requested that it be demonstrated that the proposed regulation would be enforceable. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG stated that it was the committee's intent that the result of independent study was to produce something that was not "work experience", something that "is not credit for being an assistant to a professor in a course or assisting a professor in proofreading a text" but instead "is supposed to produce a product on the student's part which is consistent with that student's academic program". PROFESSOR JACK HAND, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, requested a clarification as to whether or not a psychology major could take a 399 course as an elective and receive a letter grade. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG responded that that question would require the interpretation of the dean but that Professor Sederberg's interpretation would be that the student could not receive grade point credit if he is not counting the course for major credit. There was then discussion of some of the unique requirements of the Department of Psychology.
PROFESSOR DONALD JONES, DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES, spoke in favor of including cognates along with majors and minors to permit students taking a 399 course as part of a cognate to receive grade point credit. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG responded that it was the committee's view that "in most cases the cognate is sufficiently unstructured as to lend itself to the same kind of abuses as found with electives". PROFESSOR WILLIAM LAMPRECHT, SALKEHATCHIE, inquired as to what would happen if a student were to take an independent study course, receive a pass-fail grade, and then subsequently change his/her major. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG suggested that in that case it would be possible to appeal a grade change procedure through the petitions committee. PROFESSOR MOORE inquired as to whether this proposal was considered by the committee to be a considerable improvement over the "rampant use of independent study". PROFESSOR SEDERBERG responded that the committee did not want to imply that the abuses were "rampant" but that instead "some abuses were brought to our attention and some general complaints were made about the vagueness about some independent study and the desire to have a statement which indicated that this was indeed an integrated part of an academic program".

In response to a request by Professor Hand for an amendment of the committee motion, PROFESSOR SEDERBERG recommended the following change in the proposed wording: "Only students majoring or minoring in the relevant discipline..." to read "Only students who take independent study as part of their major or minor program...".

Thus, with the proposed amendment, the complete sentence would now read "Only students who take independent study as part of the major or minor program may receive grade point credit for independent study". The motion was seconded by PROFESSOR JAMES BUGGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE. The amendment was approved.

PROFESSOR DONALD JONES, DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES, requested a senator to propose an amendment to include the words "or cognate" in the previous amended sentence after the words "major or minor". The CHAIR requested a parliamentary ruling from Professor Charles Weasmer and then the CHAIR ruled that it was in order to amend an amendment. Therefore, PROFESSOR JAMES PATTERSON, DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND SPEECH, moved that the statement in question now read "Only students who take independent study as part of a major or minor or cognate program may receive grade point credit for independent study". The motion was seconded by PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE of the COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM who also indicated that this would be helpful to the College of Journalism because of their use of independent study in their cognate area. The motion to amend the amendment was approved. The CHAIR directed consideration to the original proposal with its amended amendments. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG made the observation that with the inclusion of the cognate, it now means that all that is excluded from grade point credit is the elective. The CHAIR called for the question on the following amended proposal:

Proposed change in the regulations governing independent study (see p. 014)

The purpose of the independent study option is to allow the student to pursue an area of academic interest not adequately covered by the regular course structure. The experience shall involve an academic product that is consistent with the student's program of study.

Prior to enrolling in an undergraduate independent study course, a student must complete an Independent Study or Internship Contract (AS-6). The approval of the instructor, adviser, and the department chair is required; students then present their approved copy when registering for the course. Only students who take independent study as part of their major or minor or cognate program may receive grade point credit for independent study. All other students will receive pass-fail credit.

The motion was approved.

D. Student Affairs Committee, Professor Kevin Lewis, Chair:

PROFESSOR LEWIS reintroduced for Senate consideration a proposal circulated with the November Senate Agenda and Minutes entitled "Proposal of the New Student Social Discipline System to be Considered by the Faculty Senate on November 3", contained in a document dated October 12, 1982, together with related materials attached to the December Senate Minutes and Agenda pages A-8 through A-13. He pointed out that the proposal included a number of specific alterations designed to incorporate recommendations from Professor William McAninch,
School of Law, a Student Government resolution, and a set of amendments adopted by the Student Government. Before specific debate on the proposal, PROFESSOR LEWIS made a number of editorial corrections.

First of all, in the October 12th document "Proposal of a New Student Social Discipline...", page 3, no. 2 which had read "the unauthorized possession or use of firearms, or weapons of any other kind such as dirks, slingshots, metal knuckles, razors or any other dangerous instrumentality is prohibited" should now read "Possession or use of firearms, or weapons of any other kind such as dirks, slingshots, metal knuckles, razors or any other dangerous instrumentality is prohibited unless authorized by appropriate University authorities".

In the same document, page 4, the passage reading "NOTE: In any case wherein students or employees..." strike the phrase "or employees".

Continuing in the same document, page 14, A, Procedures, I change the phrase "is judged to be inimical to the pursuit of the recognized mission of the University" to "to be seriously detrimental to the recognized function of the University".

Then, PROFESSOR LEWIS made an editorial change in the proposal contained in the December 1 agenda and attachments, page A-13 which had read "The Judicial Advisory Board shall consist of the following members: the Associate Director of Student Development (non-voting chairperson), the Director of Student Development, a representative of University Legal Counsel, the Director of Resident Student Development, the two faculty advisors to the Judicial Appeal Board, one student member of the Campus Judicial Board (selected by the other members of the Board), one student member of the Judicial Appeal Board (selected by the other members of the Board), the Chief Student Advocate, the Chairman of the Student Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Chairman of the Student Senate Residential Life Committee."

PROFESSOR LEWIS revised the above statement as follows (changes are underlined):

The Judicial Advisory Board shall consist of the following members: the Associate Director of Student Development (non-voting chairperson), the Director of Student Development, a representative of University Legal Counsel, the Director of Resident Student Development, the two faculty advisors to the Campus Judicial Board, the two faculty advisors to the Judicial Appeal Board, one student member of the Campus Judicial Board (selected by the other members of the Board), one student member of the Judicial Appeal Board (selected by the other members of the Board), the Chief Student Advocate, the Chairman of the Student Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Student Government Attorney General.

Finally, PROFESSOR LEWIS made the following revision: December 1 Attachments, page A-10, the section which read: "5) Page 13; #19..." was revised to read "5) Page 13; #10...

PROFESSOR LEWIS informed the Senate that his motion "is that the proposed system as set forth when amended by the ten amendments and with the minor corrections that I read be fully passed and be fully implemented as of July 1, 1983".

The CHAIR recognized PROFESSOR ROBERT FELIX speaking as the Chairman of the Faculty Advisory Committee who informed the Senate it was the opinion of the Faculty Advisory Committee that this proposal "is a reasonable piece of work and should be looked on favorably". It was the committee's opinion also that the amendments by Professor McAninch "provided additional safeguards". PROFESSOR FELIX also pointed out to the Senate that although in the proposed schedule of offenses there is no specific item dealing with violence to the person, nevertheless, this is quite accurately taken care of in item 8 of the original document which serves as a contract and hence the committee found that satisfactory. PROFESSOR FELIX also added that although there was no specific reference "to matters having to do with drugs, item 18 speaks generally of the University's policies and procedures and is immediately followed by the statement of University Drug Policy passed by the University Board of Trustees". He concluded that that too was satisfactory to the Faculty Advisory Committee and that the committee therefore recommended approval of the total package.

The CHAIR, in accordance with standing rule of the Faculty Senate number 8, granted permission to the Student Government Association President, Mr. Ashley Abel, to address the Senate. Mr. Abel offered to respond to questions from Senators and to react to any proposed changes they might have. The Senators had no questions or comments to President Abel.
ASSOCIATE PROVOST STEPHEN ACKERMAN made reference to the document dated October 12, 1982, entitled "Proposal of a New Student Social Discipline System ... ", page 3, number 2 under the heading "Firearms and Other Deadly Weapons" and informed the Senate that the proposed wording "unless authorized by appropriate University authorities" is "somewhat vague" and he suggested instead that it would be more appropriate to "identify the specific authority". He explained that there might be some inherent danger that a student could "mistake permission given by a hall counselor for an approval by appropriate authority". PROVOST ACKERMAN suggested instead that the appropriate authority should be specified as the Dean of Students.

PROFESSOR LEWIS commented about the matter of Criminal Justice majors who are twenty-one years of age, and are of junior and senior and/or graduate student status, who have become part of the security force, and are authorized to temporarily carry firearms in certain situations. PROFESSOR JAMES BUGGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, inquired as to whether or not those students are "uniformed when they carry firearms"? PROFESSOR LEWIS stated that he believed that the uniform is "grey slacks, blue blazer with a patch ... they look kind of like young lawyers ..." PROFESSOR DAVID REMBERT, DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY, made a brief expression of reservation about the idea of students walking around campus with firearms and spoke in support of Provost Ackerman's recommendation. PROFESSOR JAMES BUGGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, inquired as to whether or not those students are "uniformed when they carry firearms"? PROFESSOR LEWIS stated that he did not understand why a University official would authorize the use of 'razors or any other dangerous instrumentality'. PROFESSOR LEWIS requested clarification from those responsible for this specific recommendation. MARSHA DUNCAN, DEAN OF STUDENT AFFAIRS, responded that this was not her recommendation and that she did not know the source of this recommendation. PROFESSOR ROBERT FELIX responded that this was a recommendation from the Faculty Advisory Committee and that "the intention was to strengthen the presumption against authorized possession by treating all possessions as unauthorized unless permitted". Speaking personally and not for the committee, PROFESSOR FELIX concurred with Provost Ackerman about the merit of having some specific official being designated as the appropriate person to give such authorization.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, spoke in support of Provost Ackerman's suggestion and made a motion to substitute for the wording "appropriate University authorities" the phrase "the Dean of Student Affairs". This was seconded by PROFESSOR GLENN ABERNATHY, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES. The SECRETARY repeated the revised motion for consideration as follows: "Proposal of the New Student Social Discipline System ... " page 3, item 2, Firearms and Other Weapons - Possession or use of firearms, or weapons of any other kind such dirks, slingshots, metal knuckles, razors or any other dangerous instrumentality is prohibited unless authorized by the Dean of Student Affairs". The amendment was approved.

PROFESSOR GLENN ABERNATHY spoke on the matter of possession of razors in light of the fact "both males and females at least have some kind of a razor". He therefore stated his assumption that the purpose of this regulation was "to avoid possession of straight razors" and he therefore moved that the regulation be clarified and amended to specify "straight razors". This was seconded by PROFESSOR OLIVER WOOD, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION. PROFESSOR JAMES BUGGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, spoke against the amendment and indicated that the present phrasing serves to exclude weapons. Thus a razor would be illegal when used as a weapon. The amendment was defeated.

The CHAIR called for the question. The Senate voted its approval of the entire student discipline proposal.

IV. Report of Secretary.

No report.

V. Unfinished Business.

PROFESSOR BRIAN FRY, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, inquired of the Provost for information on "how we estimate what the revenues will be and on the projected budgeting expenses is that the equivalent to the current budget or are we including new programmatic ventures in calculating the shortfall"? PROVOST BORKOWSKI responded that the calculated shortfall does not include new programs. In terms of the calculation of projected expenses, the Provost explained that what was done was to project our fixed base in addition to the projected salary increases which he estimated to be in the magnitude of 7 or 8%, of which the
University must come up with 30%. The PROVOST explained that the minimum needs analysis was established over and above what the Budget and Control Board had recommended. As for Professor Fry's request about projected revenues, the PROVOST commented that the state of South Carolina had projected a revenue increase of approximately 6% based on the state's current level of economic activity while at the same time the spending level of the current budget was based on a projected revenue increase of approximately 9% over last year. Therefore, the PROVOST concluded that future revenues are at best uncertain and that they also depend on whether or not new sources of revenue are found which does not appear immediately likely. PROFESSOR FRY asked what year were we talking about and the PROVOST clarified fiscal year, July 1, 1983 to July 1, 1984.

VI. New Business.

PROFESSOR ALICE KASAKOFF, DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY, raised the problem of faculty needing to obtain computer printouts regularly during periods when the University is closed. She explained although the computer may be operating that it is not possible to arrange to get printed output. The PROVOST responded that he would follow through on this matter and that the University would certainly make an effort to see if it would be possible to meet this need. He requested a specific memorandum from the Senator on the subject. The CHAIR inquired if that was a satisfactory response to the Senator and PROFESSOR KASAKOFF responded in the affirmative. The PROVOST elaborated that the basic problem here is the substantial cutbacks in the academic support areas and, specifically, the fact that the Computer Center is now down about 11 positions. He explained that this larger problem will unfortunately have some effect on the ongoing scholarly and research activities of the faculty.

VII. Good of the Order.

No remarks.

VIII. Announcements.

No announcements.

The Senate was adjourned at 4:36 p.m.